



“Be You as Living Stones Built Up, a Spiritual House, a Holy Priesthood”: Cistercian Exegesis, Reform, and the Construction of Holy Architectures

Citation

Baker, Timothy Michael. 2015. “Be You as Living Stones Built Up, a Spiritual House, a Holy Priesthood”: Cistercian Exegesis, Reform, and the Construction of Holy Architectures. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Divinity School.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:22801841>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University’s DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

“Be You as Living Stones Built Up, A Spiritual House, A Holy Priesthood”:

Cistercian Exegesis, Reform, and the Construction of Holy Architectures

A dissertation presented

by

Timothy Michael Baker

to

The Faculty of Harvard Divinity School

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

in the subject of

History of Christianity

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

August, 2015

© 2015 Timothy Michael Baker

All rights reserved.

**“Be You as Living Stones Built Up, A Spiritual House, A Holy Priesthood”:
Cistercian Exegesis, Reforms, and the Construction of Holy Architectures**

ABSTRACT

The development of the Cistercian Order in the twelfth century came as a product of a number of eleventh-century reforms. These reforms affected all strata of society, and they impacted the way in which medieval European Christians viewed themselves, their social, political, and theological structures, the world around them, and their relationship to the Christian narrative of salvation history and eschatology. The early Cistercians built their “new monastery” (*novum monasterium*) upon an apostolic foundation of austerity and poverty, informed by a “return” to the *Rule of Benedict* as the program for their daily ritual and liturgical lives. These Cistercians centered their monastic “way of life” (*conversatio*) around the pursuit of ascent into God, seeking to become “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God.”

The language of twelfth-century Cistercian ascension theology drew from a number of scriptural motifs for its expression. For example, Bernard of Clairvaux described his monastery as the “heavenly Jerusalem” and his monks as “Jerusalemites”; Aelred of Rievaulx spoke of “living stones,” building up the Temple of Jerusalem and rising up as sacred incense; and Helinand of Froidmont exhorted his monks to climb the mountain with Christ and to raise up within themselves a Temple of “living stones,” becoming bearers of Christ like Mary, his holy mother. In the case of these and other Cistercian exegetes, the goal remained the same: by interpreting Christian scripture and tradition, Cistercian theologians sought to transform the monastery into a sacred space, bridging the gap between the human world and the realm of God,

so that they, and their brethren, might ascend “as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction:	
A Voice Crying Out From the Wilderness	1
Chapter I:	
Building a Kingdom, Old and New	37
Chapter II:	
Citizens Among the Saints and Members of the Household of God	109
Chapter III:	
Raising a Temple of “Living Stones”	179
Conclusion:	
Be You as Living Stones Built Up, A Spiritual House, A Holy Priesthood	251
Appendix I:	
Helinand of Froidmont’s Sermon on the Assumption of Mary	261
Works Cited	281

FOR MY PARENTS

*Et erunt ut conplaceant eloquia oris mei
et meditatio cordis mei in conspectu tuo semper
Domine adiutor meus et redemptor meus*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For a project that regards monastic liminality and practices of ascension, it is entirely appropriate to begin by acknowledging those who have conducted me up the mountain of graduate school to its culmination. Students of religion might characterize them as the “teachers of the *sacra*,” as the instructors of those holy mysteries necessary to ascend from one state of being to another; truly, they are the guides of this particular rite of passage. Thus, I acknowledge and thank, with the highest possible praise, Kevin J. Madigan, Beverly M. Kienzle, and Jon D. Levenson. I am much indebted to their wisdom, their compassion, and their unfailing generosity.

The possibility of undertaking this project required familiarity with, and interest in, the examination and interpretation of medieval manuscripts. In this, and in many other regards, I am grateful to M. Michèle Mulchahey (PIMS, University of Toronto) for accepting me into her program in manuscript studies, for instilling in me a passion for paleographical pursuits, and for remaining a valuable friend and resource as I pursue my own editorial projects in rare book collections at home and abroad. I also extend my gratitude to Patrick Latour, curator of the Bibliothèque Mazarine (Paris, France), who graciously and openly welcomed me into the library while I was examining and editing Helinand’s sermons.

While researching and writing this project, I have been living away from the city streets of Cambridge, on a mountain and in the woods of Vermont near Dartmouth College, the place where I first read Jean Leclercq’s formative *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*. Back in the place where my academic journey once began, I hasten to thank Christopher MacEvitt and Ehud Benor in the department of Religion, Cecilia Gaposchkin in History, and Paul Christesen in Classics. The interest that each of them has shown in my work, and the thoughtful suggestions that each has made to my endeavor, both encourages me and strengthens my scholarship.

In addition to erudite guides on my intellectual excursion, I am most grateful and most fortunate to have had the very best of companions to share my struggles along the way. Kathryn Kunkel, who administrates the Th.D. program at Harvard, has always proven to be a valuable resource and a helping hand; my colleagues and I are fortunate to have her on our climb.

Amanda Czechowski, Jonathan Dame, Jennifer Dame, and Carolyn Hooper Goetinck are most deserving of special praise and acknowledgement. Truly the very best of friends for which anyone might hope, Amanda's steadfast kindness, Jon's strong and grounding presence, Jenn's playful enthusiasm, and Carolyn's gentle and abiding wisdom makes each of them an invaluable companion and very much beloved. Their abiding friendship brightens every new path with the promise of adventure, and I owe much to each of them.

Finally, I wish to thank my parents—Michael Baker, Diane and James Myers. Their constant and enduring love and support has enabled this dissertation to come to fruition. No matter where my journey leads, they are always there to keep me safe. They are surely worthy of the highest honor, and I remain ever grateful to them. I am really and truly blessed to be their son; for that reason, I dedicate this work to them.

Timothy M. Baker

August 15, 2015

In Assumptione Beatae Mariae

Introduction

A Voice Crying Out from the Wilderness

Hear, O heavens, the words which I speak; let the earth pay heed to the words of my mouth... in a wasteland He found him, in a place of horror and of vast wilderness. He led him around, and he taught him; he cared for him as the pupil of his eye.¹

Many, if not most, students of medieval history have read Jean Leclercq's *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*.² Noteworthy both for its beauty and for its erudition, Leclercq's "study of monastic culture" presents the reader with an image of the twelfth-century monastery transformed from an earthly cloister into a heavenly abode, a "Jerusalem in anticipation," by the power of words and actions encoded in liturgy, song, daily rituals, *lectio divina* (or the practice of meditative reading on sacred texts), and the intracommunal attempt to ascend into God. This staple of undergraduate and graduate classrooms endures in relevance even among senior medievalists, who continue to agree with and to cite *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* alongside Leclercq's more advanced corpus of interpretive and editorial projects. Many classroom texts lose some of their savor as one progresses "from milk to solid food," to borrow a metaphor from the Apostle Paul (cf. 1 Corinthians 3:2), but *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* remains intellectually nourishing for scholars of all levels.

¹ [All translations are mine unless noted or cited otherwise.] "Audite, caeli, quae loquor: audiat terra verba oris mei.... Invenit eum in terra deserta, in loco horroris, et vastae solitudinis: circumduxit eum, et docuit: et custodivit quasi pupillam oculi sui"; from the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1–43, here vv. 1, 10).

² Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Catherine Misrahi, 3rd ed. (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982).

In his study of monastic culture during the high Middle Ages (that is, the period of time roughly from the eleventh century through the thirteenth century), Leclercq claimed that monks became fascinated with the relationship between their monasteries and the “heavenly Jerusalem” as an organizing locus for exegetical, theological, and spiritual interpretations related to the monastic *conversatio*, or “way of life.”³ Many agree with the work of Leclercq and of others who cite a generalized monastic preoccupation and fascination with the “Jerusalem that is up above,” (cf. Galatians 4:26); however, the reasons that directed these monks towards their special engagement with a spatial, allegorical, and exegetical *topos*, which had been present within the Christian tradition since the time of the New Testament, have not been discussed in sufficient depth. Moreover, few scholars who note the twelfth-century interest in the “heavenly Jerusalem” have offered a critical discussion of this motif within the broader societal context within which it appears to have emerged. Leclercq, for example, who subtitled his work, “A Study of Monastic Culture,” focused mostly upon the Cistercian Order generally and upon Bernard of Clairvaux more specifically. Thus, we might ask ourselves: what, if anything, made the emerging Cistercian Order particularly inclined towards exegeses centered upon “Jerusalem,” and what might a richer study of Bernardine and Cistercian exegetical material tell us about the seemingly ubiquitous, and ubiquitously-accepted, presence of the “heavenly Jerusalem” both in high medieval Europe and among its theologians?

In the pages that follow, I consider the idea of the “heavenly Jerusalem” within the context of exegetical constructions of sacred space, initially among the tenth-century community of Cluny and then principally among members of the Cistercian Order in the twelfth and the early-thirteenth centuries. I shall argue that monastic exegetes adopted and transformed

³ Ibid., 53–70, esp. 54–57.

elements of western Christian exegetical tradition in order to respond to their embedded historical, social, and theological contexts. I intend to show that the use of exegesis to fashion the monastery into a sacred space represented a central element of Benedictine monasticism and that the Cistercians, as a reform Benedictine community, constructed an idea of a sacred space and sacred community particular to their Order as a way of uniting both their empirical history to their account of their historical origins (their “mythology” or their “idealized history”) and their idealized history to the all-important trajectory of Christian salvation history or eschatology. In order to set the field of inquiry, I begin by discussing the historical origins of the Cistercian Order as a modern historiographical problem. Thereafter, I present some methodological techniques developed among medieval historians, literary theorists, and scholars of religion for the interpretation of religious and exegetical texts, as these will represent the tools used to investigate the idea of the “heavenly Jerusalem” within its high medieval context.

A PLACE OF HORROR AND VAST WILDERNESS?

In the decades prior to the First Crusade (1096), western Christendom underwent a series of ecclesiastical and spiritual reforms, which both flowed from the “top down” and rose from the “bottom up.” Taking place in the aftermath of the Carolingian dynasty, during a period marked by political intrigue, upset, and innovation, the spiritual climate of the medieval West began to change from one primarily shaped by the “Old Testament” to one informed by the “New.”⁴ In the midst of this process of spiritual, political, and intellectual transformation—and coincident with the massive, armed pilgrimage of Crusade—a zealous monk, alongside his equally zealous

⁴ That is to say, the ancient regime of Charlemagne’s court, populated with “David” and “Daniel” and “Solomon,” began to be supplanted by a reform-minded clergy and by a new devotion to the *vita apostolica*, a program of emulating the life of Christ, his apostles, and the proto-Church of Acts. I discuss this more fully in the first chapter.

companions, undertook their own pilgrim journey, southeast from Molesme to “a place of horror and of vast wilderness” where they would found a “new monastery” (*novum monasterium*) known as Cîteaux (Lat., *Cistercium*).⁵

Robert (c. 1029–1111), abbot and founder of the Benedictine abbey of Molesme, left his cloister and made his wilderness journey alongside Alberic (d. 1109), Stephen Harding (d. 1134), and several other reform-minded monks in order to establish a more stringent religious order that more fully embodied the spirit of the reforming age. Thus, Robert and his “apostles” founded their new monastic settlement to observe the *Rule of Saint Benedict* strictly and “to the letter” (*ad apicem litterae*) and to repopulate the hours of the day, heretofore filled with Masses and liturgy, with set periods for manual labor, for liturgical devotion, and for *lectio divina*, or sacred reading. This “apostolic” project, as conceived by these proto-Cistercians, was designed to leave behind the monastic excesses of the tenth and eleventh centuries in favor of a new age of austerity, obedience, poverty, and *communitas*.⁶

⁵ The Latin name, according to historian Louis Lekai, likely derives from “*cis tertium lapidem miliarium*,” “on this side of the third milestone” of the old Roman road between Langres and Chalon-sur-Saône. Initially the monastery was simply called “*Novum monasterium*,” the “New Monastery”; see, Louis J. Lekai, *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1977), 14.

⁶ The intentions of these new monks are recorded in the so-called “Primitive Documents” of the Cistercian Order, particularly in the *Exordium Parvum*, chapters 1–3 and in the *Exordium Cistercii*, chapter 1. The “primitive documents” of the Cistercian Order, which include the *Chapter General*, the *Exordium Parvum*, the *Summa cartae caritatis*, and the *Exordium Cistercii*, range in their dating from the early twelfth century to the third quarter of the twelfth century. For these documents, critically edited and presented with translation, see Chrysogonus Waddell, ed., *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: Latin Text in Dual Edition with English Translation and Notes*, Cîteaux. Studia et documenta 9 (Cîteaux: Commentarii cistercienses, 1999). The “origins” account of the foundation of Cîteaux contained within these texts, which was once widely accepted by scholars, has undergone criticism in the last several decades. Louis Lekai both discusses the early documents in the context of his history of the Order and he provides a translation of them as an appendix (trans. by Bede K. Lackner), see Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 13–32; 442–466. Lekai described these documents as a mixture of genuine and

The story of the Cistercian Order, of an order born out of a spirit of pioneering and reform that transformed the landscape of medieval Europe both physically—as the monks made farms from swamps and forests—and culturally—as new houses extended a monastic network across the region—remains a favorite tale among students of medieval studies. Medievalists have employed the oft-cited epic of the almost supernatural growth expanding outward from Cîteaux and its daughter-houses during the early decades of the twelfth century to describe such disparate things as the expansion of medieval culture, the rise of “monastic spirituality,” and the precursors to the thirteenth-century mendicant movements.⁷ While scholars of Cistercian history, such as Louis Lekai in *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* and Martha Newman in *The Boundaries of Charity*, have maintained the general historicity of the medieval origins narrative

constructed accounts which contained both early and later material; see esp. *Ibid.*, 21–23. Martha Newman closely considers the Cistercian concept of “charity,” but she is less explicitly concerned with the Cistercian *Carta caritatis* in addition to the other “primitive documents.” For a short introduction to these texts for the purposes of her argument, see Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180*, *Figurae* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 47f, 69. For Berman’s discussion of the contemporary debate on the historicity of these documents within the context of her study, see Constance H. Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 3–23, 46–68.

⁷ Bernard’s role in the variously constructed histories and the historiographical debates surrounding the Cistercian Order cannot, and indeed will not, be understated. Not only was Bernard influential during the course of his lifetime, his influence continues to be felt. Regarding the contemporary study of the Cistercian Order, Jean Leclercq’s *Sancti Bernardi Opera* (1957), a critical edition of Bernard’s writings, set a standard for the creation of editions of monastic texts. Indeed, Leclercq’s discussion of manuscript transmissions and his presentation of Bernard’s Latin, previously incomplete and restricted to Mabillon’s 1667 six-volume edition *Sancti Bernardi Opera omnia*, (Paris: Apud Fredericum Leonard) and to Jacques-Paul Migne’s 1854–55 *Patrologia Latina* [hereafter *PL*], vols. 182–185 grounds many studies in Cistercian spirituality and theology, including this present study. Furthermore, as discussed above, Leclercq’s interpretive *L’amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu: Initiation aux auteurs monastiques du Moyen Âge* (1957, [Trans: *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*]) remains a foundational work on monastic spirituality and thought. For Leclercq’s “inauguration” of modern Cistercian studies, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, 8 vols. (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957).

of the *ordo cisterciensis*, other scholars, notably Constance Berman in *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*, have challenged the usefulness of the “primary documents” as a reliable source.

In 1977, Louis Lekai undertook to write a one-volume history of the Cistercian Order from the time of its foundation up to his present day.⁸ *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* remains an important textbook for understanding the historical narrative of the Cistercian Order set within the context of a discussion of its successes and its failures—its “ideals” and its “realities”—as a monastic community intent on the strict observance of the *Rule of Benedict*. Lekai’s observations on Cistercian spirituality, architecture, economics, and political involvement undergird studies of Cistercian history that follow it. Whether these later studies stand in agreement with or seek to challenge some of Fr. Lekai’s claims, his work remains a consistent resource.⁹ In *The Cistercians*, Lekai argued that internal activities of reform, in addition to external criticisms leveled by the secular clergy against monastic “excesses,” led to the development of an intense nostalgia for an eremitical, “desert,” lifestyle that ultimately brought about new heights of monastic asceticism during the eleventh century.¹⁰ This

⁸ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, ix.

⁹ Consider, for example, the recent *Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, which the editors divided along the same schema as Lekai’s book (with the first part discussing history and a subsequent series of topical investigations, such as spirituality, art, architecture, etc.). A glance at the Table of Contents to the *Cambridge Companion* suffices to demonstrate that Cistercian studies remain very much in conversation with Lekai’s work. See, Mette Birkedal Bruun, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, Cambridge Companions to Religion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), vii–viii.

¹⁰ The criticisms leveled against monastic houses, such as those within the Cluniac network of priories, during the eleventh century were fairly extensive, and these included such things from “the unnecessary sounding of bells, the protracted chanting of hymns and the conspicuous use of ornament” to a lack of penance and mortification and to the derogation of duties as well as the abandonment of manual labor prescribed and required in the *Rule of Benedict* [48]; see, Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 4.

“corrective” shift, however, led to the loss of Benedictine moderation in favor of unsustainable austerity.¹¹ The Cistercian Order emerged within the context of the growing debate between monastic excess and eremitic privation in order to champion a return to Benedict’s moderate rule for coenobitic cloisters.¹²

Within the context of ongoing debates regarding the proper conduct of monks, Lekai argued that Robert established his first abbey at Molesme (1075) with the intention of creating a community that brought desert ascetical ideals into conversation with monastic moderation. Shortly after its foundation, however, gifts, donations, and increasing secular involvements led Molesme to resemble more closely the much-maligned Cluniac houses than other “reformed” Benedictine houses. Thus, Robert’s choice to depart from Molesme, and his desire to found Cîteaux as a community that returned to the strict observance of the *Rule of Benedict* in opposition to Cluny, had its origins both in years of interreligious argumentation and in the personal unrest felt both by him and by his closest followers.¹³ “The Cistercian movement was, above all, a movement of spiritual renewal,” Lekai writes, and this renewal was understood by the community as a return to the *Rule of Saint Benedict* over which “they were meant to keep a jealous guard lest they should omit even a jot or a tittle.”¹⁴ According to Lekai’s account, “a clear-cut program, able leadership, cohesion and a sense of victory scored over strong opposition [e.g., over the opposition of Cluny] became the elements which constituted the first medieval

¹¹ See Ibid., 10.

¹² Ibid., 13.

¹³ Ibid., 12–13.

¹⁴ “ita regulae incubantes, ut nec iota unum nec apicem praetereundum putent”; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, 4.514 (PL 179:1288). Cf. Matthew 5:18.

‘order,’ an organization, visibly distinct among the many autonomous or loosely affiliated conglomeration of Benedictine houses.”¹⁵

Martha Newman’s account of the emergence and the early history of the Cistercian Order shares a number of elements in common with Lekai, such as her perception that the Order developed under the aegis of ecclesiastical, social, and exegetical reform. Her work, which is narrower in its historical scope than Lekai’s general history, focuses principally upon the Cistercians as a reforming order that reformed the age. In *The Boundaries of Charity*, Newman’s account of Robert of Molesme differs from Lekai inasmuch as she argues that Robert, while somewhat innovative, nevertheless started to fashion Cîteaux into the image of Molesme. Thus she regards the eventual papal decree that recalled Robert to Molesme along with those monks “who did not love the wilderness”¹⁶ as a boon rather than a loss; in that moment, she writes, the fledgling monastery “lost its most conservative members: those men most likely to form the new monastery in Molesme’s image.”¹⁷ Those who remained at Cîteaux were the “Cistercians,” men who withdrew from pre-existing monastic frameworks in order both to return the inner workings of their cloister to the *Rule* and to create something new through their innovative interpretation of *caritas*, “charity.”¹⁸

Newman writes that “[The Cistercians] ‘withdrawal’ was less an attempt to avoid all social entanglements than an effort to differentiate the social role of monks from that of either

¹⁵ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 21.

¹⁶ “Quidam monachi cum eo qui heremum non diligebant”; *Exordium parvum* 7 in Jean de la Croix Bouton and Jean Baptiste van Damme, eds., *Les plus anciens texts de Cîteaux*, Cîteaux. Studia et documenta 2 (Achel: Abbaye cistercienne, 1974), 64–65. For a later, expanded discussion of Robert of Molesme’s departure, see Conrad of Eberbach’s *Exordium magnum* I.15, *Ibid.*, 68.

¹⁷ Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 47.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 8–9, 17.

the secular clergy or the knightly aristocracy,” and she observes that “their interest in expressing and analyzing their motivations and feelings, and their empathy for the feelings of others, provide central examples of the period’s new affective spirituality.”¹⁹ Unlike contemporary monastic communities (citing Cluny), Newman interprets the Cistercian language of ‘withdrawal’ as one meant to champion a vision of the cloister as a sacred island in a profane world, separate and holy, where the monks sought spiritual perfection in disengagement and in isolation: “with the support of their community,” she remarks, “monks and abbots could develop an interior silence in which they could hear the voice of God.”²⁰

Constance Berman, who constructed her work as a response to scholars such as Lekai and Newman, understands the creation narrative of the Cistercian Order quite differently and rather controversially.²¹ She introduces her *The Cistercian Evolution* both by describing Lekai’s work as a kind of protective bulwark for budding academics against the ire of invested Cistercian scholars and by explicitly rejecting the notion of “charity” established in Martha Newman’s

¹⁹ Ibid., 2.

²⁰ Ibid., 53.

²¹ See Berman’s preface to *The Cistercian Evolution* in Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution*, xi–xxiv, esp. xi–xiii. Constance Bouchard, when reviewing Berman’s study, reminds her readers that J.-A. Lefèvre in the 1950s and Jean-Baptiste Auberger in *L’Unanimité cistercienne primitive* (Achel, 1986) both argued, prior to Berman, that the Cistercian Order did not begin until the third-quarter of the twelfth century. Each of these studies lacked, however, a discussion of why the monks would rewrite their early history—their mythology—at a later date; see, Constance B. Bouchard, “Review of ‘The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century France,’ by Constance Hoffman Berman,” *Journal of Religion* 81, no. 1 (2001): 119–120. Bouchard ultimately describes Berman’s work as important to Cistercian studies, although not always convincing. Martha Newman, likewise, proclaimed Berman’s book “important and provocative,” allow she qualifies this by stating that “Berman’s redating of Cistercian history may eventually prove correct, but her argument is not yet convincing”; Martha G. Newman, “Book Review: The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe,” *Catholic Historical Review* 87, no. 2 (2001): 315–316.

study from several years earlier.²² For Berman, the Cistercian Order neither emerged from the reforming programs of the eleventh century as a new kind of monastic community based on “New Testament spirituality” following Lekai nor did the Order, under the exegetical auspices of *caritas*, serve as a community of reform during the twelfth century as Newman claims; rather, Berman understands the Cistercian Order as a monastic network composed of various, unaffiliated reforming communities that joined together sometime prior to the third quarter of the twelfth century, at which time they set out to reform themselves into the “Cistercian Order.”²³ Berman almost wholly rejects the “origin myth” of the foundation of the Cistercian Order. According to her, the Cistercian Order was not founded in 1098 by Robert of Molesme at Cîteaux, was not constituted in the 1110s with the *Charter of Charity*, and was not approved by Pope Callixtus II (c. 1065–1124). The Cistercian Order was, rather, a late twelfth century invention.²⁴

Berman argues that Cistercian communities were based not on the colonization of “deserts” and “wildernesses” but on the incorporation of pre-existing monastic settlements. She

²² Berman writes that “Father Louis J. Lekai bears responsibility for years of encouragement; I have long thought that he designed his ‘Ideals and Reality’ model as a way to protect young scholars like me from attacks like those made on Lefèvre”; Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution*, xxi. Newman, in fact, thanked Berman in her acknowledgements to *The Boundaries of Charity* for an advanced draft of some of her work, so the conversation among Lekai, Newman, and Berman is longstanding; see Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, x. Citing Newman’s *Boundaries of Charity* and Brian Stock’s *The Implications of Literacy* (more on him below), Berman asks: “if Cistercian administrative structures appeared only sometime after the mid-twelfth century, can we still describe a ‘conversation’ about monastic *caritas* taking place among early reforms at Clairvaux and Cîteaux, and call that discussion of mutual concerns about monastic life a ‘textual community’?”; Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution*, xxi. In short and despite Berman’s doubts, I think that the answer to her question is yes, but only if we ask a somewhat more responsible question to our sources. My discussion of this problem appears below and in the subsequent chapter.

²³ Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution*, xv–xvii.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, xi–xii.

proclaims: “it is now possible to assert that the old model of ‘apostolic gestation’ in which a mother-house in Burgundy sent out twelve monks and an abbot, or twelve nuns and an abbess, which is still found in many accounts of individual Cistercian foundations, misrepresents the facts.”²⁵ With few exceptions, she states, no references to a Cistercian General Chapter appear before the mid-twelfth century and even these “so-called” references she does not fully accept as referring to what other scholars consider the “General Chapter.”²⁶ Berman does accept the particular spirit of reform ascribed to the eleventh and twelfth centuries by Lekai and others, who depict the Cistercian Order as emerging whole and intact from this milieu of change, but she argues that “monastic communities adopted such Cistercian practices [i.e., practices from Cîteaux] because they proved effective solutions to real and nearly universal problems for the new twelfth-century reform monastic houses.”²⁷

Insofar as Bernard of Clairvaux is said to be a “Cistercian,” Berman contends that “Bernard’s personal intervention in the local affairs of many independent groups gradually led to the creation of a group of houses subject to him and to Clairvaux. This group of Clarevallian abbeys was indistinguishable from other religious congregations of the time. It was wholly dependent on Bernard’s charismatic personality for its cohesion, and it is distinct from the later Order.”²⁸ So influential, in fact, was Bernard’s monastic network that Berman hypothesizes that

²⁵ Ibid., xii.

²⁶ Ibid., xiii.

²⁷ For reasons that I will explore more fully below, this concession on the part of Berman is crucial to my approach for discussing Cistercian history and textuality in the light of these deeply contradictory histories of the period. For the discussion by Berman, see Ibid., xiv.

²⁸ Ibid., xvi–xvii.

it was perhaps the attempt to curb the power of Clairvaux that ultimately led to the creation of the Cistercian Order in the mid-twelfth century, following the death of Bernard.²⁹

The present study does not propose to provide a definitive account of the early history of the Cistercian Order in response to the historiographical questions raised by Lekai, Newman, Berman, and others. That must be a project for another time, and both Brian Patrick McGuire and Chrysogonus Waddell have written important and persuasive responses to Berman's critique.³⁰ Rather, this study investigates the way in which early Cistercian accounts of their

²⁹ Ibid., xvii. Bernard's influence on his contemporaries appears rather astounding, and he has been described as the "*de facto* second Pope." In fact, Bernard himself noted, when writing to Pope Eugenius III, his former student, that "people say that I am the Pope, and not you. They come to me from all sides weighted down with their cares. It would be scandalous and sinful to refuse my help to so many friends"; Letter 239, quoted by Jean Leclercq in his "Introduction" to Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux: Selected Works*, ed. G. R. Evans, Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 55.

³⁰ McGuire writes that "'Bernard's Concept of a Cistercian Order: Vocabulary and Context' [presents] my response to the claim of Constance Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia, 2000), that the Order did not exist before the death of Bernard. Bernard's letters show that he conceived of himself as being a member of a well-organized monastic order based on Cîteaux"; see, Brian Patrick McGuire, *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 36, n. 96. See also Christopher Holdsworth's critique of Berman in the same volume; Christopher Holdsworth, "Bernard as a Father Abbot," in *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux*, ed. Brian Patrick McGuire, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 169–219. For the full text of McGuire's response, see Brian Patrick McGuire, "Bernard's Concept of a Cistercian Order: Vocabulary and Context," *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 54 (2003): 225–249. This article appears after McGuire's initial critique of Berman's position in his 2000 review; see, Brian Patrick McGuire, "Charity and Unanimity: The Invention of the Cistercian Order. A Review Article," *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 51 (2000): 285–297. Waddell's response appears both in his edition of the Cistercian "Primitive Documents," Waddell, *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: Latin Text in Dual Edition with English Translation and Notes*, 145–156; and in Chrysogonus Waddell, "The Myth of Cistercian Origins: C. H. Berman and the Manuscript Sources," *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 51 (2000): 299–386. Berman answered her critics in Constance H. Berman, "A Response to McGuire and Waddell," *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 53 (2002): 333–337; and Waddell and McGuire reply directly thereafter on pages 339–344 and 345–346, respectively. For further discussion of this historiographical problem and the surrounding debate, see Marie Therese Flanagan, *The*

Order intersected with intellectual and exegetical developments during the twelfth century. In other words, this project explores the Cistercian narrative of what “must have happened” and what “must be true” in order for the Order to locate itself properly within the overarching trajectory of Christian salvation history which, for the white monks and for other members of medieval Christendom, governs the passage of time from creation unto the eschaton. Cistercian exegetes, much like other religious literates and interpreters, sought and uncovered meaning in the Bible, as the holy word of God, and in the structuring edifice of tradition (e.g., patristic authors, early medieval theologians, monastic innovators, etc.).

The historical and historiographical problem outlined above by looking briefly at the work of Lekai, Newman, and Berman represents a real and present problem: without resolution, the multiplicity of conflicting historical interpretations has the potential to hinder investigation into the history of the Order. This project of intellectual history is related, but not defined, by that ongoing debate. I am choosing to shift the methodological lens in order to proceed less encumbered by concerns of empirical “facts.” Berman raised an important challenge, however unconvincing it may be, against the traditionally-held interpretation of Cistercian institutional organization in the early twelfth century, but her challenge did not extend to “Cistercian” exegetical continuities; that is to say, her revisionist history does not dispute the idea that various monastic houses held in common theological beliefs that we have come to describe as hallmarks of the Cistercian Order. Therefore, I am going to treat the “Cistercian Order” as a corporation of houses tied together by shared exegetical strands of theology, eschatology, and anthropology. As such, I will engage with the *ordo cisterciensis* as, what Brian Stock calls, a “textual community”:

Transformation of the Irish Church in the Twelfth Century (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010), 124–129, esp. 126, n46.

a community of members who understand and define themselves through their identification, construction, and interpretation of a jointly-held and discrete set of texts. Since Lekai, Newman, and Berman agree that members of the Cistercian Order (whether they be “true” Cistercians or communities looking to Cîteaux for exegetical guidance) share a distinct textual core (which I will define more fully as we proceed), we may use the model of the “textual community” to uncover the connections between Cistercian autobiography and theology and prevailing twelfth-century accounts of Christian cosmology, eschatology, and the temporal vector of salvation history without becoming entrenched in contemporary positivistic debates of historicity.

THE *ORDO CISTERCIENSIS* AS A “TEXTUAL COMMUNITY”

Brian Stock, in *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past*, observes that “one of the problems awaiting historians is to sort out the role that speaking, listening, reading, and writing played in shaping attitudes toward the living past.”³¹ The past remains accessible to the modern historian only in glimpses and through lenses tinted with bias, and so the contemporary viewer is left with snapshots that must be arranged in some kind of meaningful sequence. As a result of such stringent limitations—the implications of which are increasingly considered and explored within the modern academy—Stock writes:

Among intellectual historians, positivistic assumptions, where they are not under attack, appear to be dying a natural death. Accounting for what actually took place is recognized to be only part of the story. The other part is the record of what individuals thought was taking place, and the ways in which their feelings, perceptions, and narratives influenced or were influenced by the events they experienced.³²

³¹ Brian Stock, *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 158.

³² *Ibid.*, 16. Stock’s use of the term “positivism,” and my subsequent adoption of his language, requires some further explanation. In a later essay, he clarifies as follows: “the historian in the

The work of Lekai, Newman, and Berman exploring Cistercian texts and foundational documents primarily represents accounts of “traditional” positivistic history embedded and discussed within a traditional historiographical framework. That is to say, Lekai, Newman, and Berman in particular, attempted to write accounts of what “actually happened” during the twelfth and the later centuries.³³ Their theses require that Cistercian events remain inextricably bound to a broader timeline of medieval society, which is why the question of “why would the late-twelfth-century Cistercians choose to rewrite their history?” proves perplexing to those invested in traditional paradigms of history writing.

Brian Stock presents a useful program by which one may proceed in investigating the intellectual and textual history of medieval communities alongside and informed by, yet distinct from, their positivistic history. He writes:

One potential approach is to investigate the relationships between individuals in groups that are actually using texts for literary or social purposes, while at the same time paying close attention to the historical context of their actions as well as to consequences. The point of departure for this method is Weber’s notion of subjectively meaningful social action, to which one adds a distinction between intersubjectivity, a feature of minds, and intertextuality, an aspect of writings.

positivistic tradition assumes that event is related to fact rather than to relation—that is, to an assumed objective reality, not to a system of interdependent factors, some subjective, some objective. As a result, a text, even one that treats events alone, cannot itself be an event: it is something that is derived from real or imagined events”; Ibid., 80.

³³ Brian Stock offers an important discussion of the process of writing history that bears reproduction here. He writes: “Historical writing is largely the story of perceived change. ... Even quantitative history, the most ambitious of recent objectifying techniques, does not provide a satisfactory account of transformations in the external world. I do not wish to argue that *esse* equals *percipi*, or that pure objectivity, like subjectivity, is indescribable. These are problems for philosophy. I merely content that, for the historian engaged in the everyday practice of his craft, objectivity and subjectivity exist in a rough continuum. Drawing a hard-and-fast line between them is impossible. The historian tries to use the evidence in such a way that his bias or that of the original participants is balanced by countervailing forces, to which he often attempts to give an air of theoretical respectability. But in the last analysis his approach boils down to common sense”; Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 76.

What results is the analysis of what I call “textual communities,” which are microsocieties organized around the common understanding of a script.³⁴

Stock’s concept of the “textual community” allows one to consider the Cistercian Order within its greater Christian context as a society of members possessing a unique set of “texts”—both texts original to the Cistercians and texts held in common with society at large—that direct Cistercian actions in tandem with and in distinction to the rest of medieval western Christendom. Brian Stock defines the “textual community” as “a group that arises somewhere in the interstices between the imposition of the written word and the articulation of a certain type of social organization. It is an interpretive community, but it is also a social entity.”³⁵ For my analysis of the Cistercian autobiographical narrative of the place of the Order within Christian salvation history, Stock’s construction of the textual community is particularly apt.³⁶

Following from Stock’s suggestion, the theses crafted by Lekai, Newman, Berman, and others are by no means excluded from the investigation; rather, these histories form an essential backdrop to any investigation into the Cistercian “textual community,” as these studies provide a necessary account of its broader historical and societal contexts. Moreover, these histories provide information regarding the manner in which the broader society responded to the Order, and they offer us an account of how members of the Order responded and adapted to their social context: the work of these historians provides an account of the *Sitz im Leben*, the overall

³⁴ Ibid., 22–23.

³⁵ For this quotation, and for a fuller definition of the “textual community,” see Ibid., 150.

³⁶ Stock writes: “the organizational principles of movements like the Cistercians were clearly based on texts, which played a predominant role in the internal and external relationships of the members. The outside world was looked upon as a universe beyond the revelatory text; it represented a lower level of literacy and by implication of spirituality. Within the movement, texts were steps, so to speak, by which the individual climbed towards a perfection thought to represent complete understanding and effortless communication with God”; Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 90.

“setting in life,” for the Cistercians and for their “texts” undergoing scrutiny.³⁷ Stock describes the textual community as a “combination of narratives” within which “it is not a text but life that is seen as a story [with] a beginning, a middle, and an end, a climax and a denouement,”³⁸ and I argue likewise that the Cistercian autobiography, which dictates the actions, ideals, and motivations of the community, is fundamentally a story: it is an ethical and an aesthetic narrative both of the Cistercians’ perceived role in mundane history vis-à-vis their social interactions with secular and religious society and of their role in supramundane history, or eschatology, vis-à-vis their exegetical interactions with Scripture and tradition.

“TEXTUAL COMMUNITIES” AND THE “RULE OF FAITH”

Stock distinguishes between ancient societies, which developed textual communities around pre-existing texts, and medieval societies, which developed textual communities around the construction of a text.³⁹ In making this distinction, he intends to articulate a paradigm shift in societal values related to the appropriation, the engagement with, and the construction of texts over time, but he goes a bit too far. The Cistercian community did not develop in a vacuum, and

³⁷ For a definition of the term “text,” I rely upon Stock’s definition of the same, which expands the meaning of “text” to include both written objects and oral events. Stock writes that “the written word was the symbol of the inner, often unconscious, and divinely or diabolically inspired network of sense. Out of this arose the desire for a grammar that could accommodate both literary and social relations. The element that allows us to study [the subjective awareness] of change effectively is not literacy but textuality. What we inquire into is the specific uses of texts: who uses them, and why. Texts, I add, are both physical and mental. The ‘text’ is what a community takes it to be. Texts have propositional content, but they are procedural knowledge”; Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 146.

³⁸ Ibid., 152.

³⁹ Stock writes: “in medieval communities, inasmuch as nonliteracy was the rule, the texts were short, simple in message, and not deeply contextualized. By contrast, in antiquity, when an educated community was assumed, the writings were longer, more complicated, and inseparable from their historical contexts. As a consequence, in the Middle Ages, the text often started up the community. In antiquity, the community preceded the critical text, which might bring about reform, reorganization, or sectarianism”; Ibid., 151.

their choice of texts, their exegetical construction of texts, and the privilege that they assigned to some texts over others in order to fashion and to develop as a community had a particular context. Stock writes that “contexts exist; and they have the potential to transcend textual communities, as churches inevitably consolidate their identification with the narratives of which they are a part.”⁴⁰ While this is true, Stock’s perception of the impact that textual community microsocieties might have on their broader macrosociety does not accompany a similar statement of recognition that identifies the macrosociety as a socializing force directing the thought patterns held by those choosing to segregate and to withdraw. I suggest that hermeneutic precedents developed and sustained in “context” define the initial construction of, and the ultimate transformations of, the textual community. These transformations, in turn, modify and augment their greater “context.” In other words, influence flows in both directions. Based upon the hypothesis that textual communities select and construct their central “text” through processes influenced, even dictated, by their broader societal context, I would like to consider briefly early developments of Christian tradition. More specifically, I would include work that has been done on the late antique idea of a “rule of faith.”⁴¹

An early Christian rule of faith, as an organizing principle, first appeared in the writings of Tertullian (160–220), specifically in *De praescriptione haereticorum* (*Regarding the*

⁴⁰ Ibid., 151f.

⁴¹ See, for example, the recently edited Festschrift volume (honoring Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J.) that explores the ways in which the “rule of faith” served both as a container of content, namely of the Christian tradition, and as a object of function, a “norm that guides the Christian’s faith... [which] guided the formation of the New Testament canon... and then, once a New Testament was established, the rule of faith functioned as the norm for its right interpretation”; Ronnie J. Rombs and Alexander Y. Hwang, eds., *Tradition & The Rule of Faith in the Early Church* (The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), x.

Prescription against Heretics), where he expresses an early creedal statement.⁴² Origen (182–254) developed the idea further in his *Peri Archon* (*On First Principles*) where he describes the rule of faith as an admonition for exegetical boundaries constructed by Scripture and tradition.⁴³ Augustine (354–430) explained the guiding principles and methodologies under which the rule of faith may (indeed, must) be used for the exegetical interpretation of Scripture in *De doctrina*

⁴² Tertullian writes: “Let us make our search, therefore, in our own and from our own and concerning our own; provided only that nothing comes into question which attacks the Rule of Faith. Now the Rule of Faith—that we may here at this point make our profession of what we maintain—is unquestionably that wherein our belief is affirmed that there is but one God, the Selfsame with the Creator of the world, Who produced all things out of nothing through His Word sent down in the beginning of all things; that this Word is called His Son, Who in the Name of God was seen under diverse forms by the patriarchs, was ever heard in the prophets, and lastly was brought down by the Spirit and Power of God the Father into the Virgin Mary, became Flesh in her womb, and being born of her lived as Jesus Christ; that thereafter He proclaimed a new law and a new promise of the Kingdom of Heaven, wrought miracles, was crucified, and on the third day rose again, was caught up into the heavens, and sat down at the right hand of the Father; that He sent the Vicarious Power of the Holy Spirit to lead believers; that He will come with glory to take the saints into the enjoyment of life eternal and of the heavenly promises, and to adjudge the wicked to fire perpetual, after the resurrection of both good and bad has taken place together with the restoration of their flesh. This Rule, taught (as it will be proved) by Christ, admits no questionings amongst us, save those which heresies introduce and which make heretics”; Tertullian, “On the Prescription of Heretics,” in *On the Testimony of the Soul and On the “Prescription” of Heretics*, trans. T. Herbert Bindley (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1914), 53f.

⁴³ Origen (following Rufinus’ Latin translation of the *Peri Archon* [*De Principiis*]) writes: “Many of those, however, who profess to believe in Christ, hold conflicting opinions not only on small and trivial questions but also on some that are great and important... In view of this it seems necessary first to lay down a definite line and unmistakable rule in regard to each of these, and to postpone the inquiry into other matters until afterwards. For just as there are many among Greeks and barbarians alike who promise us the truth, and yet we gave up seeking for it from all who claimed it for false opinions after we had come to believe that Christ was the Son of God and had become convinced that we must learn the truth from him; in the same way when we find many who think they hold the doctrine of Christ, some of them differing in their beliefs from the Christians of earlier times, and yet the teaching of the church, handed down in unbroken succession from the apostles, is still preserved and continues to exist in the churches up to the present day, we maintain that that only is to be believed as the truth which in no way conflicts with the tradition of the church and the apostles”; Origen, *On First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973), 1f.

Christiana (On Christian Teaching), especially in Books 1 and 3.⁴⁴ Essentially the rule of faith depicts a circular hermeneutic: Christian tradition and the words of Scripture dictate the way in which an “orthodox” exegete may interpret the Bible; properly conducted interpretations by exegetes both inform and set boundaries for the rule of faith. For the Cistercians of the twelfth century, their sense of place within their world and within the scope of Christian history and eschatology was informed both by orthodox patristic and medieval interpretive traditions and, more specifically, by the *Rule of Benedict*. Cistercian engagement with the *Rule of Benedict*, moreover, was mediated and governed by developing currents within the context of the aforementioned tradition and by innovations within their reform-minded eleventh- and twelfth-century society. Through the process of exegesis, tradition and history were, and are, linked.⁴⁵

Stock’s model of the “textual community” as a tool for assessing microsocieties embedded within a macrosociety provides a useful foundation for investigating Cistercian uses of text; however, Stock’s methodology does not account well for the transformative importance of liturgy and ritual as modalities for instructing, maintaining, and constructing “text” among the members of a religious “textual community.” For example, he does not consider ritual and liturgical actions as an important bridge between “written” and “oral” texts or, for that matter,

⁴⁴ It is interesting to note that D. W. Robertson Jr., when introducing his translation of *De doctrina christiana*, emphasizes, in words echoing Martha Newman’s discussion of the Cistercian Order, that “underlying the specific techniques of both interpretation and exposition of Scripture the principle of first importance in St. Augustine’s mind is charity”; D. W. Robertson Jr., “Translator’s Introduction,” in Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997), x.

⁴⁵ Stock writes: “For traditions to be operative in society, they must be transmitted. There is not only a *traditum*; there is also a *traditio*. In the Middle Ages, this means by oral, written, or visual communication. This type of transmission is not neutral: it is rooted in politics and institutions, and it helps to shape the message it transmits. The manner in which a tradition is handed over from one generation to the next is a clue to its place in the social fabric and the source of its legitimizing power. It also tells use something about the relation of forms of community behavior over time”; Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 162.

between ritual actors and ritual spaces. Thus, I propose that, in addition to the methodological ideas related to literacy and to textuality set forth by Stock, we also consider methods of inquiry developed within the study of religion, specifically with regard to discussions of ritual, liminality, and sacred space, in order to conduct a richer investigation into the ways in which the Cistercian textual community sought to navigate the theological boundaries between concurrent history and anticipated eschatology.

BETWIXT AND BETWEEN: LIMINALITY, *COMMUNITAS*, AND CISTERCIAN EXEGESIS

In “Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*,” Victor Turner developed upon a thesis first offered by Arnold van Gennep concerning the ritualized actions of *rites de passage* in order to “consider some of the sociocultural properties of the ‘liminal period.’”⁴⁶ Following van Gennep’s definition of *rites de passage*—namely, “rites which accompany every change of place, state, social position, and age”—Turner (and van Gennep) observed that each “rite” is marked by three phases: separation, margin (*limen*), and aggregation, such that “separation comprises symbolic behavior signifying the detachment of the individual or group from an earlier fixed point in the social structure”; *limen* describes an ambiguous state of being which holds “few or none of the attributes of the past or coming state”; and aggregation involves “consummation” of passage at which time “the ritual subject, individual or corporate, is in a stable state once more and, by virtue of this, has rights and obligations of a clearly defined and ‘structural’ type, and is expected to behave in accordance with certain customary norms and

⁴⁶ Victor Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1967), 93–111, here 93. For van Gennep’s earlier work, see Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960).

ethical standards.”⁴⁷ In essence and in practice, during the course of these rituals, subjects transcend a former state of being for another.⁴⁸

Christian proponents of the eremitical tradition have long depicted the act of separation from society and entrance into the “liminal phase” of the “desert” as a spiritually edifying and transformative process that brings the one who withdraws closer to God. Consider, for example, Athanasius’ *Life of Antony*, a late antique “best seller.” In the *Life*, St Athanasius (295–373), archbishop of Alexandria, recounts the story of St Antony (251–356), who left his family and community, entered into the wilderness of the desert, dwelt alone amidst angels and demons, and then emerged transformed in order to combat heresy. Describing Antony’s emergence from his fortress of solitude, Athanasius writes:

Antony came forth as though from some shrine, having been led into the divine mysteries and inspired by God. ... He maintained utter equilibrium, like one guided by reason and steadfast in that which accords with nature. ... And so, from then on there were monasteries in the mountains and the desert was made a city by monks, who left their own people and registered themselves for the citizenship in the heavens.⁴⁹

In this fourth century *vita*, Athanasius developed a Christian articulation of separation—a liminal state of purification and education—which either leads to partial reintegration (as Antony

⁴⁷ Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, 94.

⁴⁸ For example, Turner observes that, during the Ndembu *rite de passage* into adulthood (a circumcision ritual), a boy may be ritually debased (likened to a menstruating woman) by his community prior to being sent into the woods for a period of days in order to fend alongside other boys undergoing the ritual. During this period of ritual separation, the “liminal state,” the child is no longer a boy, for he has been ritually stripped of his boyhood, and not yet a man, for he has not been returned to the society whose social structure governs his place in the world. Here the child is meant to undergo a transformation, to seek a new vision and principle of being, and to be instructed in the knowledge of the *sacra*, the knowledge of things holy and accursed. At the conclusion of the liminal period, the subject reintegrates with his society, he is reintroduced and lauded as a man, and his responsibilities to uphold customs and law are augmented. Thus, he transitions from one state of being to another. See, *Ibid.*, 96, 101, 106.

⁴⁹ Athanasius, “The Life and Affairs of Our Holy Father Antony,” in *Athanasius*, trans. Robert C. Gregg, Classics of Western Spirituality (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980), 42.

returns to the world, albeit transformed) or to anticipated aggregation in heaven (as the monks register for citizenship in the “desert city”). His *Vita* of St. Antony set a precedent for interpreting the life of the cloister, and this ideal state of monastic withdrawal is clearly liminal in its construction.

Martha Newman describes the Cistercians as a group of individuals who “saw themselves as living a life of penance on earth rather than as inhabiting an antechamber of heaven that they had entered when they decided to join a monastery,”⁵⁰ but I contend that they saw themselves as doing both. The monastic cloister enclosed both the practices of ritual debasement (penance) meant to transform the monks into the “no man” of the liminal phase and the teachings of the *sacra* necessary for reentry into society. In the case of the Cistercians, however, reentry occurs only after death, as the society joined is the community of the saints.⁵¹ Within the monastic liminal space and in anticipation of aggregation with the citizens of the “heavenly Jerusalem,”

⁵⁰ Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 54. Newman argues this way at least partially in order to contrast the Cistercians with the monks of Cluny whom she describes as those who “portrayed themselves as ‘immaculate lambs’ who lived on the threshold of heaven and provided for the salvation of their society by joining the heavenly choirs in song and aiding God in his never-ending battle against evil”; *Ibid.*, 135.

⁵¹ Consider, for example, how Bernard describes entry into Clairvaux (as Jerusalem) in his letter to Alexander of Lincoln. He writes, “[the novice] entered into the holy city; he chose inheritance with those about whom it is rightly said, ‘*for now you are no longer guests and wayfarers, but fellow citizens among the saints and members of God’s household*,’” (Eph. 2:19). Coming and going with them, just like one of the saints, he boasts—he along with the others—saying: “*our way of life is in heaven*,” (Phil. 3:20). For he has become not simply an inquisitive observer, but an avowed inhabitant and an enrolled citizen of Jerusalem (*although not of this [Jerusalem] on earth, to which mount Sinai of Arabia is joined and which is enslaved along with her sons, but of that [Jerusalem] of the free, which is our mother on high*), (Gal. 4:25–26); Letter 64, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, ed. Jean Leclercq and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 7 (Romae: Editiones Cistercienses, 1974), 157. I discuss this letter in detail in the second chapter.

the Cistercians sought both to embody apostolic virtues, such as of poverty and austerity, and, importantly, to pursue the egalitarian ideal of *communitas*.⁵²

The idea of *communitas* within the ritual process of a rite of passage describes the ritualized leveling of societal strata that occurs both during the liminal phase among the ritual subjects and during the period of reintegration among the ritual actors. In order to enter the liminal state, separation transpires when the ritual subject undergoes a specific kind of treatment that marks difference (such as ritual elevation or ritual debasement). For these objects of ritual separation, their status becomes that of the “wholly Other,” and they possess nothing of their former, or their anticipated, rank within their society. The ritual actors (e.g., the members of the community) likewise undergo a transformation that alters their status within the field of the ritual. In their case, this transformation is one of social leveling: the high and the low become equals for the period of the ritual, and each member of society speaks and acts in one accord. This state of ritual leveling is what Turner describes as *communitas*.⁵³

For twelfth-century reformers looking towards an apostolic ideal, the prime example of Christian *communitas* was the early church presented in Acts. In the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, which purports to chronicle the state of affairs following Jesus’ death, the fledgling followers of Christ left aside worldly ambitions and possessions to pursue a common goal maintained among equals. Cistercian monks, in their zeal to return to the *Rule of Benedict*, possessed yet another exemplar of *communitas* in the idealized community depicted by the very

⁵² Regarding the notion of liminal poverty, Turner writes, “a further structurally negative characteristic of transitional beings is that they *have* nothing. They have no status, property, insignia, secular clothing, rank, kinship position, nothing to demarcate them structurally from their fellow. Their condition is indeed the very prototype of sacred poverty”; Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, 98–99.

⁵³ Victor Turner, “Liminality and Communitas,” in *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Aldine de Gruyter, 1995), 94–130, esp. 96–7, 128–9.

Rule towards which they aspired.⁵⁴ The reforming monks recognized these examples as ideals, which can hardly be realized upon the earth; yet, there are clear indications that the Cistercians, by holding these models in high esteem, pursued features of *communitas* within central tenets of their Order.⁵⁵

Stock observes that Turner's theory of ritual proves helpful when investigating symbolic behaviors and structures with societies, and he notes that Turner's "notions of liminality and *communitas* are particularly useful tools for discussion, since they owe their origin to medieval patterns of activity."⁵⁶ Yet, Stock concludes that "Turner's ideas are mainly applicable at a

⁵⁴ The *Rule* itself recognizes the archetypal structure of its community in the church of Acts. Consider *RB* 33.6: "All things should be the common possession of all, as it is written, 'so that no one presumes to call anything his own,' (Acts 4:32)." Turner specifically identifies the *Rule of Benedict* as an example of Christian *communitas*; *Ibid.*, 107, 129. Turner, however, does not discuss the fact that the *Rule* is a text, an idealized picture rather than a realized community. This is why Stock's "textual community" becomes a useful investigatory model because the "textual community" represents a community constantly under creation and recreation as it (re)negotiates itself in conversation with its central texts.

⁵⁵ The exact timeframe and the degree to which the Cistercians succeeded in creating an experience of *communitas* such that, for examples, abbots were equally subject to the *Rule* as other monks, monks had the duty to chastise and to encourage each other for their spiritual wellbeing, and common markers of status such as table assignments during meals were leveled, is not entirely clear. Martha Newman takes some time to explain her perceptions of Cistercian *communitas*-inspired changes both in contrast to earlier monastic houses such as Cluny and Molesme and in solidarity to the ideal of *caritas* in her discussion of "The Consolation of Holy Companionship"; see, Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 42–53.

⁵⁶ Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 153. Caroline Walker Bynum offers an alternative, and in some ways more fitting, critique of Turner's theory of liminality. Bynum argues that Turner's theory is derivative of, and dependent upon, "the Christianity of a particular class, gender, and historical period," by which she means "educated Western male elites." In a way, Bynum's critique of Turner, namely that his concept of liminality is limited to men and, within that limitation, is most applicable to male elites during the high Middle Ages, strengthens my point even as it narrows the usefulness of the methodological tool. Bynum is convinced that, for a specific subset of society (the subset into which Cistercian monks would fall), Turner's theory of liminality is both applicable and instructive. As such, I acknowledge the points of her critique at the same time that I maintain Turner's usefulness for the present investigation. For Bynum's full analysis, see Caroline Walker Bynum, "Women's Stories, Women's Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner's

macrosociological level. They are much less help in microsociology, which is the natural domain of the textual community.”⁵⁷ On the one hand, Stock’s assessment appears true: the concept of *communitas* concerns the leveling of the entire social hierarchy and the universalization of common values whereas the textual community is, by its very nature, a society of individuals defined by a central text in distinction to the society at large. On the other hand, the self-reflective language of Christian monastic communities broadly, and of the Cistercians especially, contains elements that are best understood in terms of *communitas* and liminality.

I will explore these aspects in Cistercian thought more expansively in the coming chapters, but let it suffice for now to recognize that the language of “citizenship with the saints [of the heaven]” (c.f. Ephesians 2:19), which appears with some frequency both in Bernard’s writings and among other Cistercians of the twelfth century, is employed to indicate a certain practice of *communitas* that is partially realized on earth among members of the Order in anticipation of a full realization of this ideal in heaven. Moreover, the language surrounding the monastic cloister and the Benedictine vows of entrance are clearly liminal both in their construction and in their intent. When a monk under the *Rule of Benedict* chooses to enter the cloister, his vows ritually separate him from his former society and they place him within a liminal ritual space—delimited by physical and exegetical boundaries—until the moment when death translates him into another state of being.⁵⁸

Theory of Liminality,” in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (Zone Books, 1991), 27–51, here 28, 33.

⁵⁷ Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 153.

⁵⁸ Here we might observe Bernard’s own self-reflective lament when he describes himself as a “chimera.” The monastic ideal, the “true Cistercian,” is the one who enters the liminal space of cloistered *communitas* until the individual and communal quest for perfection leads to

I am less hesitant than Stock to recognize an interplay of ideas which flow bidirectionally from the broader society into the textual community and from the textual community into the broader society.⁵⁹ Therefore, I am not as troubled by the applicability of Turner's models for explanation. Twelfth-century Cistercians, who described their project as one "seeking perfection [or ascension]," maintained a keen eye and ear towards the social and religious climate of medieval western Christendom, and they kept a finger placed firmly on the pulse of societal and ecclesiastical politics. Their language of "perfection" depended upon their knowledge of the "imperfect." This rhetorical and exegetical dependency within the Cistercian community allows us to investigate its actions by using methodologies applicable both macrosociologically and microsociologically to the textual community, and Stock's model of the textual community and Turner's discussion of ritual provide useful modes for discussing interpersonal relationships within the monastic cloister. In addition, studies related to the liturgical and exegetical

aggregation among the saints of the heavenly Jerusalem. Bernard, on the other hand, exists too much in this present world for him to take comfort in his fate. He writes, "my monstrous life cries out to you, my guilty conscience. For I am a kind of chimera of my time, I am neither cleric nor lay. For long ago did I cast off the way of life of the monk, just not the habit [i.e., clothes]," "Clamat ad vos mea monstrosa vita, mea aerumnosa conscientia. Ego enim quaedam Chimaera mei saeculi, nec clericum gero nec laicum. Nam monachi iamdudum exui conversationem, non habitum"; Letter 250, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 147.

⁵⁹ As mentioned briefly above, Stock interprets the flow of influence to be one that draws from the greater society at the genesis of the textual community but also one that is then severed by the community as it defines itself around its "text." Only at the dissolution of the textual community (and here only potentially) does the greater society receive some form of influence back as "context." On this initial genesis of the textual community and its relationship to ritual, Stock writes the following: "We can say that the members of such a community will, intend, project, and shape their futures. Based on the commonly held rules of the group, they think they are guiding their courses of action, and this thinking conspires with events to give a sense of order and direction to what they do. So conceived, the textual community introduces a new level of ritual into everyday life"; Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 153.

construction and the maintenance of sacred space opens interpretive avenues for linking persons to place and for understanding the monastery as a “field of ritual.”⁶⁰

BOUNDARIES OF SANCTITY: CONSTRUCTING A CITY OUT OF A CLOISTER

When Bernard of Clairvaux described his monastery as “Jerusalem” inasmuch as his monks were “Jerusalemites,” or “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God,” his analogy could be meaningful only insofar as it made recourse to cosmological and cosmogonic ideas as well as to theories of sacred space that were held in common by his audience. In the parlance of twentieth-century religious studies, Mircea Eliade observes that “every sacred space implies a hierophany, an irruption of the sacred that results in detaching a territory from the surrounding cosmic milieu and making it qualitatively different... the paradoxical point of passage from one mode of being to another.”⁶¹ Eliade describes the process whereby the divine presence irrupts into mundane space and time as a bridge that connects the realm of the sacred to the realm of the profane and thus transforms a delimited profane space in

⁶⁰ Ronald Grimes argues that one should consider six categories when “mapping the field of ritual”: ritual space, ritual objects, ritual time/timing, ritual sound and language, ritual identity, and ritual actions; see, Ronald L. Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*, Rev. ed., Studies in Comparative Religion (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 24–38.

⁶¹ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 26. Eliade returns to this idea elsewhere when he writes: “paradoxical coming-together of sacred and profane, being and non-being, absolute and relative, the eternal and the becoming, is what every hierophany, even the most elementary, reveals”; Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (London: Sheed and Ward, 1958), 29. According to Eliade, this act of irruption or “hierophany is always a historical event (that is to say, [it] always occurs in some definite situation) [although this] does not lessen its universal quality”; see, *Ibid.*, 3.

the process.⁶² Transformed space is dangerous without ritual preparation, as that which is *sacer* is at once “sacred” and “defiled” and so ontologically threatening or “taboo.”⁶³ As such, boundaries are constructed to separate the sacred from surrounding profane space.⁶⁴ When Bernard equated Clairvaux and Jerusalem, he united the sacred power of the city to his monastery, and thus he established a bridge between the worlds of the sacred and the profane within the walls of his cloister. The project of the Cistercian textual community, as an organization based upon the interpretation of a central “text,” was to teach the knowledge of the *sacra* to the inhabitants of this monastic liminal space in order that they might share in the knowledge of the divine and so cross the sacred bridge from one state to another.

Any event of hierophany (or, in certain cases, theophany) is constrained by historical time and physical space. This is why certain places for certain peoples become invested with sacred power (e.g., Mount Sinai, the Temple Mount, etc.). In some instances, the interpretation of an event may transcend its geographic and temporal particulars, however. The line connecting heaven and earth can move, and the pivot can wobble.⁶⁵ Sacred spaces may be contained by

⁶² Elsewhere Eliade describes the “irruption” of the sacred as a “bridge” or “manifestation” which “ontologically founds the world”; Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, 21.

⁶³ Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, 15, 17.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 370. This process of boundary creation is recognizable both in the most obvious of instances, such as in the construction of a temple, and in a slightly modified way in certain mundane cases, such as in the construction of city walls which fortify inhabitants both from military attack and from the incursion of demonic forces; see Ibid., 371. We shall see how St Bernard regarded the monastery as a sacred citadel that protected its inhabitants from martial and demonic forces in Chapter Two when we consider some of his parables.

⁶⁵ Examples of this “wobbling pivot” would include Jewish ritual practice after the destruction of the Second Temple, which transforms the family table into the altar, and Christian sacramental theology, which permits multiple points of hierophany via the celebration of the Eucharist. Eliade’s student, J. Z. Smith, describes this “wobbling pivot” in terms of two kinds of religious systems: locative systems, which require a specific sacred location for their vocabulary of

physical boundaries, but they cannot be constructed solely from them; nevertheless, there is a symbolic element inherent in human construction. Cistercians, such as Bernard, used the power of exegetical language to translate sacred power first by abstracting from the particular to the universal (e.g., from the “earthly Jerusalem” to the “heavenly Jerusalem”) and then by applying the universal to the particular (e.g., from “heavenly Jerusalem” to “Clairvaux”). In this regard, Eliade observes that “any new human establishment of any sort is, in a sense, a reconstruction of the world. If it is to *last*, if it is to be *real*, the new dwelling or town must be projected by means of the construction ritual into the ‘center of the universe.’”⁶⁶

Within the context of sacred space and ritual, the interpretive actions performed by Bernard and by other Cistercians prove rather profound in their implications. Insofar as he enacted a fairly complex exegetical program of what J. Z. Smith describes as “transposition,”⁶⁷ Bernard employed language to transform the significance of his monastery from a common religious space into an *axis mundi*, a place where heaven and earth meet. Put another way, when Bernard of Clairvaux declared that Clairvaux *is* Jerusalem, he, in essence, created an exegetically constructed sacred space via identity.⁶⁸ If Clairvaux, or another Cistercian monastery, is

meaning, and utopian systems, which require “no place” for their practice; see, Jonathan Z. Smith, “The Wobbling Pivot,” *The Journal of Religion*, 1972, 147.

⁶⁶ Emphasis in the original; Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, 373.

⁶⁷ Smith writes: “The activity of *transposition* is one of the basic building blocks of ritual and a central object of ritual thought. The capacity to alter common denotations in order to enlarge potential connotations with the boundaries of the ritual is one of the features that marks off its space as ‘sacred’”; Jonathan Z. Smith, “Constructing a Small Place,” in *Sacred Space: Shrine, City, Land*, ed. Benjamin Z. Kedar and R. J. Zwi Werblowsky (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 18.

⁶⁸ Smith engages in an extended discussion of the complexities of transposing sacred space, which he describes as difficult due to the locative and spatial constraints of any previously established sacred space. Using the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as an example, he argues that, “if the sacred space (such as the *Anastasis*) is not (or cannot) be present, its power is diminished.” In order to solve this issue, Christians liturgically structured time such that

Jerusalem, then Clairvaux and the other monasteries are sacred spaces insofar as Jerusalem is a city that straddles the boundaries of heaven and earth: it is both mundane and supramundane.⁶⁹ Moreover, by locating the sacred quality of Clairvaux/Jerusalem within the community as “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God,” Bernard dislocated the sacred space from objective anchors, and he relocated the sacred space to within a commonly maintained exegetical network of beliefs shared among the Cistercian textual community. Liturgical actions—performed daily and established within a yearly cycle—likewise united members of the community within their sacred locality even as these activities served to reinforce the sanctity of time and space around the brethren.

Exegesis as an expression of religious text and liturgical action is able to accomplish that which bricks and mortar cannot: physical construction is occasional and limited, but exegesis and the creation of a text within a ritual context permits the monastery to be continually *reconstructed* and *reidentified* as a sacred Jerusalem exactly in the way that Eliade described when he observed that “the idea of a sacred place involves the notion of repeating the primeval hierophany which consecrated the place by marking it out, by cutting it off from the profane space around it.”⁷⁰ The primeval hierophany may have once occurred in a city in the Near East,

“temporal sequence, story, the festal calendar allowed a supersession of place by creating a new schematics of time.” In addition to temporal restructuring, other strategies for ritual transposition of sacred space included “a metonymical project of exchanging parts for wholes” (e.g. the taking of relics from one holy site to sacralize another location) and “a metaphoric project of exchanging relations of equivalence for those of identity” (e.g., the construction of models of sacred spaces elsewhere). In Smith’s language, Bernard’s exegeses represent the metaphorical project of transposing Jerusalem from the Near East to France at Clairvaux. See, *Ibid.*, 20.

⁶⁹ Eliade writes, “The temple or sacred city, in turn, as the place through which the Axis Mundi passes, is held to be a point of junction between heaven, earth and hell;” Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, 375.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 368.

but its exegetical identity repeats and so recreates and consecrates Cistercian monasteries across Europe.

A PROJECT OF REFORM AND A PATH TO ASCENSION

The spirit of reform and inquiry that pervaded all elements of twelfth-century European society (ecclesiastical, political, economical, etc.) arose from events of the eleventh century, particularly during the second half of the century, which set the stage for the so-called high Middle Ages, the pinnacle of medieval western thought and ecclesiastical activity. In order to inquire more fruitfully into Cistercian interpretations of their monasteries as “Jerusalem,” “the Kingdom of God,” we must begin at a time prior to Robert’s journey into the wilderness in order to establish relevant context.

In Chapter One, I consider exegetical precedents from Cluny, an important Benedictine Order, which emerged at the beginning of the tenth century. Additionally, I outline eleventh-century ecclesiastical reforms, and I discuss Cistercian justifications for their Order in contradistinction to Cluny. I argue that certain key institutional differences between Cluny and Cîteaux may be understood within the context of differing interpretations of the “Kingdom of God.” The concluding pages of this chapter introduce the reader to a central figure of the twelfth century, St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), through one of Bernard’s earlier works (written in 1120), the *Apologia ad Guillelmum Sancti Theoderici Abbatem* (*The Apology to William of Saint-Thierry*). In this text, Bernard offers a Cistercian response to Cluny, including an explication both of the strengths of Cîteaux in reform and of the persistent shortfalls of Cluny to do the same.

Chapter Two continues the discussion began with Bernard's *Apologia* by first considering a letter that Bernard wrote in 1129 to Alexander, the bishop of Lincoln, on behalf of a novice monk named Philip, who had just entered Clairvaux. This chapter undertakes to explain in what ways Bernard's description of Clairvaux as an earthly "Jerusalem" and a "vision of the heavenly Jerusalem" would be meaningful to his monks and to other religious of his age. I argue that Bernard presents his monastery as a sacred space within which the individual monk pursues ascent into God while serving both as a ritual subject and actor and as a liturgical contributor to the liminal community. In the same way that rites of passage move the ritual subject from one state of being (e.g., adolescence) to another state of being (e.g. adulthood) through a ritual period of separation and reintegration, I explore the monastic cloister as a physically- and exegetically-constructed liminal space that exists between the state of the human (corruption) and the state of the saint (perfection). In my interpretation of Cistercian theology, I recognize no moment of reintegration that ends the period of ritual separation: the monastic cloister represents a liminal space that anticipates a shift in being after death, but it does not permit that shift to occur in life.⁷¹

⁷¹ This depiction of the cloister is not unique to my project, and the notion of the monastery as a place of death in life is well established in early Christian interpretations of eremitism. In the *Life of Antony* mentioned above, for example, Antony's first act of withdrawal led him to the tombs outside his village where he enjoined a friend to seal him away and to come only occasionally with bread. At one point, after contending with demons, his friend finds him "lying, as if dead, on the ground, [the friend] picked him up and carried him to the Lord's house in the village, and laid him on the earth. And many of his relatives and the people of the village stationed themselves by Antony as beside a corpse"; see, Athanasius, "The Life and Affairs of Our Holy Father Antony," 37. The eremitic ideal, as the tradition develops, is one in which the monastery, like Antony's desert, serves both as the city of monks and as their tomb.

A textual community develops from an accumulation of scriptures, interpretations, daily rites and customs, and oral “texts” important to the members of that community.⁷² Chapter Three explores select occurrences of the theological concepts of sacred space and ascension within the exegetical thought of two additional Cistercian authors: Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–1167), the so-called “Bernard of the North,”⁷³ and Helinand of Froidmont (c. 1160–1237). Aelred’s work offers another example of the Cistercian association between the monastery as a “Jerusalem in anticipation” by virtue of the community living within its walls and the Cistercian pursuit of ascent into God.⁷⁴ Aelred, who used the binary images of “mud bricks” and “living stones” to describe various kinds of people within the world, admonished his brethren to become the “living stones” of the Temple of Jerusalem and so to be the “most spiritual contemplators of spiritual things.”⁷⁵ As the twelfth century drew to a close, the reforming spirit that began in the eleventh century continued, but the height of monastic spirituality had been reached, and the influence of the cloister began to wane in the light of emergent scholasticism. Put another way,

⁷² Oral elements such as sermons and chapter discourses alongside other day-to-day activities of the cloister are key elements of the textual community. Henri de Lubac, in *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, observed that the “quotidian imagery” used in monastic sermons, letters, and theological treatises united physical practices to intellectual interpretations of scripture. De Lubac, in his chapter on tropology, focuses specifically on the expression of mystical tropology via quotidian imagery, and he discusses therein the development of the trope of the monastery as a “heavenly Jerusalem”; Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, vol. 2, Ressourcement (Grand Rapids, Mich./Edinburgh: W.B. Eerdmans/T&T Clark, 1998), 127–177, esp. 134–153.

⁷³ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 39.

⁷⁴ Leclercq writes, “[the monastery was] a Jerusalem in anticipation, a place of waiting and of desire, of preparation for that holy city toward which we look with joy”; Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 56.

⁷⁵ In a treatise to his friend Ivo, Aelred writes: “the contemplator of the most spiritual of spiritual things is found, not in any place inside Jerusalem, but in the Temple” (inuenitur itaque spiritalis spiritalium contemplator, non in quolibet loco in Ierusalem, sed in templo); Aelred of Rievaulx, *De Iesu puero duodenni* 3, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Opera ascetica*, ed. Anselm Hoste and Charles H. Talbot, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971), pars 3, ln. 313.

spiritual and intellectual power and prestige began to depart from the “places of wilderness and vast horror” and to travel into the cities and, specifically, into the budding university system. Around the same time, the continuing failures of the crusaders led to the general consensus that the “Jerusalem in the East” might not return to Christian control. Within this context, Cistercian monks, such as Helinand of Froidmont, were faced with the task of addressing their community within a fluctuating theologico-political landscape. Helinand, a trouvère of northern France who converted abruptly to the Order, preached to his community of an interior sacred space, a Temple built up within each individual monk, in order to direct his monks to proceed inward and upward through this internalized Temple-space into the Holy of Holies where they might ascend into God before the Mercy Seat. It is at this moment, when the walls of the Cistercian cloister seem to be collapsing under changing societal structures, that I shall conclude.

Among Cistercian monks, the liminal state of separation underwent reinterpretation towards the end of the twelfth century and into the thirteenth century. The textual tradition shared within the Order understood the cloistral walls of the monastery as a bulwark against the outside world, a very real, very physical boundary between the prior life of the monk and the liminal state of anticipation lived in waiting for the heavenly Jerusalem. As this boundary was effectively (if not physically) broken down by increasing demands upon the monks to travel outside of the cloister, either to preach against heresy or to study at the emergent universities, the liminal boundary began to become internalized out of necessity. Unlike mendicant groups, such as the Dominicans or the Franciscans, the Cistercians continued to regard themselves as a monastic, coenobitic order rather than as an order of preachers. Their purpose remained the pursuit of individual and communal spiritual perfection in an unclean world. As such, the state

of the wandering monk/preacher remained cognitively and exegetically different for a member of the Cistercian textual community than it was either for a Franciscan or for a Dominican.

The Cistercian monk, as his identity developed over the course of the twelfth century, understood himself in the role of the biblical *ger* or *peregrinus*, the wanderer, the stranger in a land estranged to him, because his vows of citizenship to the "heavenly Jerusalem" separated him from the world at large. In short, he remained in a liminal state until his death when he was to be reintegrated with the saints of the heavenly city. The manner by which this liminal state was considered within the monastery, as an exegetically-constructed sacred space, depended upon the response of influential exegetes to historical problems. These responses, one may say, were "idealized" solutions to the challenges of "reality," but, however we wish to judge the success of their endeavor, I intend to show in the following chapters various ways in which members of the group that we now identify as the "Cistercian Order" used their exegetical talents to create and to recreate their institutional history from within their "sacred community" in service to a singular goal, ascent into God.

I

Building a Kingdom, Old and New

*Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed by thy name,
Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done, on Earth as it is in Heaven.*¹

The *Pater Noster*, undoubtedly the most well-known and oft-recited prayer in all of the Christian tradition, opens with a central expression of eschatological expectation.² In the Latin West, the petitioner begins the prayer using a series of three verbs: *sanctificetur*, “may [your name] be sanctified”; *adveniat*, “may [your kingdom] come”; and *fiat*, “may [your will] be done.” The subjunctive mood of these verbs expresses three things at once: it relates an expectation of reality; it conveys a hoped for future; and it directs an imperative toward something that should come to pass. Vital to the Christian faith—from its inception though the Middle Ages and to the present day—is the notion of the imminent coming of the “Kingdom of God,” which is to be anticipated with all eagerness; the narrative of Christian salvation history looks towards the realization of this kingdom as the inauguration of the *eschaton*, the teleological end of time. As time passed between the death of Jesus and his Second Coming, however, Christian exegetes and theologians were tasked with interpreting their scriptural canon—the “Old” and the “New” Testaments—in order to make sense of this delay, and the interpretations

¹ “Pater noster, qui es in caelis, sanctificetur nomen tuum. Adveniat regnum tuum; fiat voluntas tua, sicut in caelo et in terra” (Matthew 6:9–10).

² For a useful discussion regarding the importance of the Lord’s Prayer within the context of the kind of monasticism defined in the *Rule of Benedict* and in the *Rule of the Master*, which predated and informed Benedict’s *Rule*, including a presentation of this prayer as a bridge between the spiritual teachings of the Old and New Testaments for the monks under these *Rules*, see Adalbert de Vogüé, *The Rule of Saint Benedict: A Doctrinal and Spiritual Commentary*, trans. John Baptist Hasbrouck, Cistercian Studies Series 54 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1983), 9–43.

forwarded by these erudite men and women form a central pillar to the edifice of Christian tradition. Their words have helped believers to make sense of ever-changing historical circumstances in light of the unwavering inevitability of Christ's return on the Day of Judgment.

For some Christian men and women awaiting the coming of Christ, the life of the monastic cloister proved most appealing, and so a number of different monastic institutions developed around varying interpretations of the proper Christian life lived in isolation and in expectation. Among these institutions, scholars have regarded the foundation of Cluny in the early tenth century, during a period of feudal strife following the collapse of the Carolingian Dynasty, as unprecedented due to its unique charter and due to its immediate popularity, which led to the rapid expansion of the monastery into a powerful network of priories spreading across Europe. The reform-minded Benedictines, who founded the Cistercian Order at the end of the eleventh century, described their "New Monastery," their *novum monasterium*, in contrast to Cluniac opulence.

In this chapter, I shall argue that we may achieve a richer understanding both of the Cluniac program of organization and expansion during the tenth and eleventh centuries and of the Cistercian ideals of reform at the beginning of the twelfth century by examining these two institutions using the exegetical "biography" of the "kingdom of God" as our interpretive lens. I suggest that both Cluniac and Cistercian exegetes provided their communities with interpretations of the "kingdom of God" which they drew from Scripture and from Christian tradition in order to relate their communities to Christian eschatology. Historical and cultural circumstances, however, affected how these interpreters understood the biblical texts. Moreover, the multi-faceted image of the "kingdom of God" presented in the Hebrew Bible and in the New

Testament provided fertile ground for constructing a variety of “kingdoms” based upon communal needs.

THY KINGDOM COME: BIBLICAL NOTIONS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The concept of the “Kingdom of God” appears early in the Hebrew Bible among the writings of the Enneateuch (i.e., Genesis through Chronicles), recurs throughout the liturgical expressions of the Psalms, finds expression among the prophets, and develops further both in the Gospels and in the other writings of the New Testament. In this section I will discuss the “kingdom” using three broad categories: first, I consider the “kingdom of God” as a temporal kingdom that is organized hierarchically and theocratically—ruled both by God and by a king—and the existence of which remains contingent upon divine favor, manifested through the blessing of wealth and good fortune. For ease of reference, I will call this construction the “Old Testament” kingdom. Next, I describe a temporal kingdom, which is organized communally with a minimal degree of hierarchy and with a tendency towards austerity and poverty, that was designed to reflect the life led by Jesus and his Apostles. This I will designate the “New Testament” kingdom. Finally, I present the idea of the “eschatological kingdom of God” that appears throughout both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.

THE “OLD TESTAMENT” KINGDOM OF GOD

The idea of the kingdom of God in the Hebrew Bible reflects the notion of a covenantal kingdom that is realized (to a degree) in the early stages of biblical history but troubled thereafter. Central to Israel’s status as the “chosen people of God” are the events that took place during the theophany at Sinai, when the Israelites as a people pledged their covenantal

faithfulness to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. During this transformative event, God instructed Moses to tell his people:

If, therefore, you will heed my voice and you will keep my covenant, then you shall be unique to me among all peoples, for the whole earth is mine. And you shall be my royal priesthood, and a holy nation. These are the words which you shall tell to the sons of Israel.³

There, in the wilderness of Sinai, in a liminal realm across the “Yom Suph” (the “Sea of Reeds”),⁴ the Israelites entered into a suzerain covenantal relationship with God within which God promises to act as their king, and they promised to serve their thearch as a kingdom of holy priests.

Much to the dismay of the biblical authors and redactors, the covenant established during Israel’s desert sojourn underwent significant challenges soon after the twelve tribes claimed territories and developed growing administrative needs. Following the end of the period of the judges (i.e., charismatic and quasi-prophetic leaders who governed the tribes under divine mandate), the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles recount the failures of the people of Israel

³ “Si ergo audieritis vocem meam, et custodieritis pactum meum, eritis mihi in peculium de cunctis populis: mea est enim omnis terra: et vos eritis mihi in regnum sacerdotale, et gens sancta. Haec sunt verba quae loqueris ad filios Israel” (Exodus 19:5–6).

⁴ While traditionally interpreted as the “Sea of Reeds” or the “Red Sea,” Bernard Batto, following Norman Snaith, has argued that this should be read as “the sea of the end/extinction” and should be interpreted in connection to the Canaanite Baal-Yam Cycle. Batto argues that the “sea at the end of the earth [represents] a sea which in their minds [i.e., the minds of the Israelites] was fraught with connotations of primeval chaos ... here traditional mythological language is used to express the belief that the emergence of Israel as a people during the exodus was due to a creative act by [YHWH] equal to that of the original creation of the cosmos itself”; Bernard F. Batto, “The Reed Sea: Requiescat in Pace,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 1 (March 1983): 31–35, here 35. In this context, the desert sojourn thereafter might be best understood as mythological wandering in a place outside of the boundaries of real geography, as a place where the Israelites realize a sacred connection. It should be noted, however, that the position expressed by Batto (which was raised and rejected by Ibn Ezra, 1089–1167) does not represent the majority view of biblical scholars and should be regarded with an appropriate degree of suspicion.

to maintain their covenantal pact. Thus, when the people of Israel come to Samuel in order to seek permission from God to elect a king, Samuel responds with disgust. In the mind of Samuel, the establishment of an earthly monarch signaled an aberration from the true order of the cosmos, and God confirmed this fear to his anguished prophet:

Heed the voice of the people in everything that they are saying to you, for it is not you that they reject, but me, that I should rule over them. In accordance with all of the things that they have done, from the day that I lead them from Egypt until the present time, just as they forsook me, and they served foreign gods, so they do the same to you. So now, listen to them, but still bear witness unto them, and foretell to them the nature of the king, who shall rule over them.⁵

The establishment of a human king over Israel marked the dissolution of the rightly ordered kingdom of God in the minds of the Enneateuchal scribes and redactors; this much is certain.⁶ Once Israel enthroned a human king, the concept of the “kingdom of God” began to shift from direct engagement between the Lord and his vassals to a theocratic system within which the king in his palace ruled according to the will of God in his “palace,” the Tabernacle and, later, the Temple.⁷ The relationship maintained between the human king and the divine King ensured both the longevity of the kingdom and its destruction as both outcomes were products of the suzerain bond. In light of the many recorded failings of biblical monarchs,

⁵ “Dixit autem Dominus ad Samuelem: ‘audi vocem populi in omnibus quae loquuntur tibi: non enim te abjecerunt, sed me, ne regnem super eos. Juxta omnia opera sua quae fecerunt, a die qua eduxi eos de Aegypto usque ad diem hanc: sicut dereliquerunt me, et servierunt diis alienis, sic faciunt etiam tibi. Nunc ergo vocem eorum audi: verumtamen contestare eos, et praedic eis jus regis, qui regnaturus est super eos’” (1 Samuel 8:7–9).

⁶ Indeed, the redactors of the Hebrew Bible retroject concerns over human kingship into the Law of the King (Deuteronomy 17:14–16), and they use the contents of its prohibitions as an indictment against King Solomon who, in his error, “accumulates horses for himself and returns the people to Egypt” (cf. Deut. 17:16 and 1 Kings 3:1, 10:28). Both the authors and the redactors of these sections of the Hebrew Bible herald predominantly from the priestly classes, so there should be little question as to why these authors distain the loss of cultic power in favor of monarchic rule.

⁷ Although Solomon builds the Temple, the narrative of God’s tabernacle begins with Nathan and David in 2 Samuel 7.

however, the idea of the “kingdom of God” ultimately became one that was anticipated but never successfully realized. After the fall of Israel, biblical authors united the longed-for reestablishment of the “kingdom” to the hope for a renewal and a realization of the theocratic system in which the king would guide the nation as a subject to God’s divine mandate. The notion of the messiah (*mashiach*) in this regard is simply the one appointed and anointed to reinstate the proper theocratic order for Israel, “the royal priesthood, the holy nation,” within the scope of human history.

THE “NEW TESTAMENT” KINGDOM OF GOD

Following the period of the Babylonian captivity and the destruction of Solomon’s Temple in 586 BCE, Israelite hopes for their kingdom were translated to speculative messianism. When Cyrus the Great allowed Jews to return to Jerusalem and to rebuild the Temple in 516 BCE, the possibility of reconstituting the tribes of Israel under an “anointed” leader guided by God took hold. First Persian and later Hellenistic influences began to alter the landscape of biblical thought, however, such that the idea of the “kingdom of God” took on slightly different qualities from those appearing in earlier parts of the Hebrew Bible. Consider, for example, Daniel 7–12, which recounts visions associated with the much-maligned Seleucid ruler, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (*r.* 167–164 BCE). In these chapters—chapter 7 in particular—the notion of the “kingdom of God” loses much of its potential for historical realization, as the author begins to include many of the eschatological trappings that the “kingdom” would later display in the New Testament. Thus Daniel recalls:

So I saw in the dream one as if the son of man coming with the clouds of heaven, and he came forward before the Ancient of Days, and they ushered him into his presence. And he gave him power, and honor, and rule, and all peoples, tribes,

and tongues must serve him: his power is eternal power, which does not pass away; and his rule is that which is not corrupted.⁸

During the first century of the Common Era, several charismatic prophets vied for the attention of Near Eastern citizens caught in the political and cultural crossfire of Hellenistic, Roman, and Persian influences, and some of these citizens recognized the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy of eschatological intervention in the figure of a Galilean named Jesus, whom they called the "Christ," (i.e., "the anointed one"). Jesus, in each of the three synoptic Gospels, identifies with Daniel's "son of man" during his trial before the Sanhedrin (cf. Mark 14:62; Matt 26:64; Luke 22:69), and the question raised by each of the authors of the Gospel narratives is a crucial one for Christian theology: to what extent did Jesus fulfill his anointed role?

When Jesus, while preaching the Sermon on the Mount, instructed those standing before him on how best to pray (i.e., to pray the *Pater Noster*), he provided his audience both with an avenue of communication with God and with a program for how his community ought to act. For the Jesus of the Gospels, the coming of the "Kingdom of God" represents both an advent from on high and a process to be enacted on earth. Indeed, Jesus speaks about this imminent kingdom in a number of instances throughout the gospel narratives, perhaps most famously in Matthew 16:24–28:

Then Jesus said to his disciples: 'If any man wills to come after me, let him deny his very self and take up his cross and follow me. As he who will desire to save his life [or soul, *anima*], shall lose it; however, he who will lose his life on my behalf, will find it. For what does it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, but suffers the loss of his soul? Or what exchange shall a man give for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he will give back to each and every man according to his works. Amen I say to you,

⁸ "Aspiciebam ergo in visione noctis, et ecce cum nubibus caeli quasi filius hominis veniebat, et usque ad antiquum dierum pervenit: et in conspectu eius obtulerunt eum. Et dedit ei potestatem, et honorem, et regnum: et omnes populi, tribus, et linguae ipsi servient: potestas eius, potestas aeterna, quae non auferetur: et regnum eius, quod non corrumpetur" (Daniel 7, here vv. 13–14).

there are some standing here that shall not taste death, until they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.’⁹

Jesus’ message to his disciples anticipates the dawning of a new age within the very near future, but Jesus also instructs his followers to act in accordance with his teachings while they await the kingdom to come. After the death of Jesus, the church described in Acts attempted to maintain its messianic fervor, and the coming of the Holy Spirit during Pentecost (Acts 2) was cited as the fulfillment of the prophecy of John the Baptist and was used to encourage the community to persist in its devotion.¹⁰ The sermons of Peter in Acts 2 and 3 and the sermons of Paul in Acts 20 and 28 portray the “kingdom of God” on earth, as it must exist prior to Jesus’ return, as the community of believers in the God-man Jesus Christ. The early chapters of Acts, moreover, indicate that this young community, under the direction of Christ’s Apostles, strove to fulfill Jesus’ message to them by living austerely and in poverty, owning property communally and eschewing hierarchy in pursuit of “perfect” egalitarianism. These early “Christians” lived in the state of ritual anticipation that Turner calls *communitas*.

⁹ “Tunc Jesus dixit discipulis suis: ‘Si quis vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem suam, et sequatur me. Qui enim voluerit animam suam salvam facere, perdet eam: qui autem perdiderit animam suam propter me, inveniet eam. Quid enim prodest homini, si mundum universum lucretur, animae vero suae detrimentum patiat? aut quam dabit homo commutationem pro anima sua? Filius enim hominis venturus est in gloria Patris sui cum angelis suis: et tunc reddet unicuique secundum opera eius. Amen dico vobis, sunt quidam de hic stantibus, qui non gustabunt mortem, donec videant Filium hominis venientem in regno suo.’”

¹⁰ John the Baptist was said to proclaim, “Do penitence: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. ... I indeed baptize you in the water unto penitence; however, he who shall come after me—who is mightier than I and of whose shoes I am not worthy to bear—he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire” (In diebus autem illis venit Joannes Baptista praedicans in deserto Judaeae, et dicens: Poenitentiam agite: appropinquavit enim regnum caelorum. Ego quidem baptizo vos in aqua in poenitentiam: qui autem post me venturus est, fortior me est, cujus non sum dignus calceamenta portare: ipse vos baptizabit in Spiritu Sancto, et igni) (Matthew 3, here vv. 1, 2, 11; cf. Luke 3:1–18).

THE “ESCHATOLOGICAL” KINGDOM OF GOD

Jesus’ delayed return proved challenging for the early followers of Christ because the *communitas* of the church represented in Acts became increasingly difficult to maintain over time. As the community of believers increased both in number and in geographical distribution, the ability to maintain equality and coherency proved problematic. Moreover, the New Testament idea of the “kingdom of God” described an eschatological event as much as it established guidelines for the immediate “Christian” community, so the concept itself presented a confusing ambivalence.

The Apocalypse of John closes the Christian canon and addresses Jesus’ delayed second coming via a prophetic vision of the kingdom realized. As John’s vision on Patmos draws to its climactic conclusion, the Revelator observes:

I saw a new heaven and a new earth. Indeed, the first heaven and the first earth was gone, and now the sea is no more. And I, John, saw a holy city, the New Jerusalem, descending from heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. Then I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, “look upon the tabernacle of God with men, and he shall dwell among them. They shall be his people, and God himself shall be their God with them.”¹¹

The language of John’s vision recalls both God’s act of world creation in Genesis and his act of theophany on Sinai as it describes the fulfillment of the well-known dictum of Hermann Gunkel: “die Endzeit gleicht die Urzeit” (“The end of time resembles the beginning of time”). Heaven and earth are made new, the sea—an enduring symbol of chaos—ceases to be, and God bridges the chasm separating himself from his creation by a new and enduring reality. The image is one of great eschatological promise, but it also expresses a troubling historical fact:

¹¹ “Et vidi caelum novum et terram novam. Primum enim caelum, et prima terra abiit, et mare iam non est. Et ego Joannes vidi sanctam civitatem Jerusalem novam descendentem de caelo a Deo, paratam sicut sponsam ornatam viro suo. Et audivi vocem magnam de throno dicentem: Ecce tabernaculum Dei cum hominibus, et habitabit cum eis. Et ipsi populus eius erunt, et ipse Deus cum eis erit eorum Deus” (Revelation 21, here vv. 1–3).

Jesus' kingdom did not come imminently after his death, and the Church of Acts could not maintain *communitas* over time.

THE "KINGDOM OF GOD" AT CLUNY AND CÎTEAUX

As Christianity grew and developed, becoming the official religion of Rome and defining itself in terms of "orthodoxy" set against Christian "heresies," theologians and exegetes tasked themselves with negotiating the relationship between the present Church on earth and the New Jerusalem anticipated by John. St Augustine (354–430), for example, addressed the tension between present and future time in his response to the sack of Rome by the Visigoths in 410. In *The City of God* (*De civitate Dei*), he argued that Rome enjoyed its successes on account of the benevolence of God and Christ, and he maintained that the present struggle between Rome and foreign invaders had little to do with political battles and everything to do with the ongoing spiritual war being waged between the earthly City of Man and the New Jerusalem, the City of God (and the Catholic Church).¹² Intended to show the underlying (sometimes hidden) cause of historical events, Augustine's "depoliticizing" of the historical imperial conflict succeeded more in reifying the connection between divine favor and civic stability than in separating state from religion.

Centuries later, when Duke William I of Aquitaine (875–917) established a Benedictine monastery at Cluny (910), he did so for the salvation of his soul, which he felt had been imperiled by his martial actions as a feudal lord during a time of imperial unrest. After Rome "fell" for a second time upon the collapse of the Carolingian Dynasty, Europe became the

¹² For a fuller discussion of *The City of God* as it relates medieval ideas of the "New Jerusalem," see Ann R. Meyer, *Medieval Allegory and the Building of the New Jerusalem* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003), 47–65. See also the critical edition of *De civitate Dei* in Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 47, 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955).

battleground of fiefdoms at war with each other for power and for resources. Still, during this period of civil unrest, Carolingian interpretations regarding the meaning of power endured. The Carolingians had subscribed to the “Old Testament” conception of the “Kingdom of God” outlined briefly above; Charlemagne (742–814), for example, referred to himself as “King David” and he nicknamed members of his court after biblical figures.¹³ *The City of God* was read out during mealtimes at Aachen as one of Charlemagne’s favorite books,¹⁴ and Charlemagne interpreted his civic wealth and military power as a result of divine favor. Like most of their western contemporaries, the monks at Cluny followed this “Old Testament” conception of the “kingdom”: the brothers organized their new monastery hierarchically, they sought to cultivate divine favor as members of God’s kingdom, and they displayed their acquired wealth in order to show God’s approval for their endeavors.

The monks of Cîteaux, on the other hand, maintained ideas of practice and an organizational structure much more in line with the “New Testament” conception of the “Kingdom of God.” Favoring poverty and austerity within their “Jerusalem,” Cistercian monks focused less on hierarchy than on communal equality, and they encouraged each individual monk to pursue ascent into God while benefitting from communal support. Both the monks of Cluny and the monks of Cîteaux explicitly identified the exegetical construction of their “kingdom” as the optimal method by which they might secure everlasting citizenship within the “New Jerusalem” promised in Revelation. The question then becomes how did the “Old Testament” and “New Testament” conceptions of the temporal “kingdom of God” serve the needs of

¹³ Thomas F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, Middle Ages Series (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 233–235.

¹⁴ Einhard, “The Life of Charlemagne,” in *Two Lives of Charlemagne*, trans. Lewis Thorpe (Penguin, 1969), 78.

monastic groups living during the high Middle Ages as these groups sought to gain entrance into the eschatological New Jerusalem? To answer such a question, it becomes necessary to identify possible historical and theological particulars that might have led to differing interpretations of a common corpus of scripture and tradition among the monks of Cluny and the monks of Cîteaux.

CLUNY: DOORKEEPERS IN THE HOUSE OF GOD

The Carolingian Dynasty, which began with Charles Martel (686–741), was most influential under Charlemagne (*r.* 774–814), and declined after the Treaty of Verdun in 843, maintained a certain degree of orderliness in Europe during a period marked by political, economic, social, and religious unrest. The Frankish “peace,” however, demanded a substantial ecclesiastical cost. As Kevin Madigan writes:

Because churchmen regarded kingship as the best stay against disorder and violence, in the ninth and tenth centuries they gladly gave it the justification of theology and imbued it with the aura of the holy. In particular, they themselves began to regard and to describe kingship as a sacred office. Kings were compared to the great monarchs of Israelite history—to Saul, David, and Solomon.¹⁵

Although the Church permitted, even exalted the kind of “Old Testament” exegetical theology of kingdoms and kingship that praised lay masters for their salvific, even divinely-appointed, presence in Europe, the price paid for these overseers was the loss of most ecclesiastical autonomy under the “Holy Roman Empire.”¹⁶ Kings reigning during these

¹⁵ Kevin Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 120.

¹⁶ For a discussion of the “Old Testament” theology of kingdom and kingship as it developed within the medieval West, especially during the period of the Carolingian dynasty, see André Vauchez, *The Spirituality of the Medieval West: From the Eighth to the Twelfth Century*, trans. Colette Friedlander, Cistercian Studies Series 145 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1993), 11–33, esp. 12–24. See also, Joseph H. Lynch, *The Medieval Church: A Brief History* (London/New York: Longman, 1992), 183–186. For Lynch’s discussion of Carolingian influence on the Church, consider *Ibid.*, 65–72.

centuries were installed and invested into their positions under the aegis of semi-divine rites that closely reflected the election of bishops. Bishops, moreover, became subject to local lay leaders for their own investiture, requiring the pastoral staff and ring from their feudal lords, who maintained the right to choose and to veto clerical appointments.¹⁷

This state of affairs lies obviously afield of the interests of the Church, both in Rome and abroad, and, despite Carolingian activities meant to improve the education and to augment the resources of the secular clergy (at least in theory) via reform-minded legislation such as the *Admonitio Generalis* (789),¹⁸ tensions between clerical and lay leaders began to grow as early as the eighth century. Conflicts over power would only continue to build in intensity over the subsequent centuries. As Peter Brown has explained, Charlemagne “was seen to be acting in a manner that revived, in Christian times, the action of the godly king Josiah, when he had promulgated the rediscovered Law to the people of Israel.”¹⁹ Brown points to Charles’ self-identification in the Prologue to the *Admonitio Generalis*, which co-opted the story of Josiah from 2 Chronicles 34.²⁰ Charlemagne’s son, Louis the Pious (778–840), was responsible for legislation governing monastic houses under Frankish control. Following policies of reform

¹⁷ See, Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, 120.

¹⁸ The “top-down” approach presented in the *Admonitio Generalis* was, among other things, intended to provide resources and education for the clergy “because often men desire to pray to God properly, but they pray badly because of incorrect [prayer] books”; *Admonitio Generalis*, cap. 72, in Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder, eds., *Documents of the Christian Church*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 102. For a discussion of the *General Admonition*, its successes and its failures, see Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 441–450.

¹⁹ Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, 441.

²⁰ “And the [king] went up to the house of the Lord, along with each and every one of the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the priests and the Levites, and the rest of the population from the youngest to the oldest. To all of those listening at the house of the Lord, the king read all of the words of the book” (Ascendit in domum Domini, unaque omnes viri Juda et habitatores Jerusalem, sacerdotes et Levitae, et cunctus populus a minimo usque ad maximum. Quibus audientibus in domo Domini, legit rex omnia verba voluminis) (2 Corinthians 34:30).

instituted by the so-called “the second Benedict,” Benedict of Aniane (747–821), Louis the Pious’ effectively ended the period of mixed rules within his kingdom such that, by the mid-ninth century, the terms “*regula*, *regularis*, and *regulariter* meant in conformity with the rule of Benedict.”²¹ Lay influence within the ecclesiastical realm was met with some ambivalence. For example, in the organizational legislation of the Benedictine house of Cluny, which was founded early into the tenth century and under Benedict of Aniane’s version of the *Rule*, we see glimpses of reform-minded actions meant to curb lay involvement within the cloister at the same time as we recognize the Carolingian-promoted Old Testament spirituality which informed the theological and exegetical vocabulary of the age.²²

²¹ “Benedict” here reflects both the first and the second “Benedicts,” as the ninth century *Rule* contained various liturgical and practical modifications to the sixth-century “original”; see, Giles Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, Abhandlungen 43 (Berlin: LIT, 2010), 82. For a discussion of Benedict of Aniane’s life and work as it relates to the eleventh-century reforms and to the Cluniac and Cistercian communities, see Bede K. Lackner, *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux*, Cistercian Studies Series 8 (Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1972), 1–39.

²² The use of the terms “Cluny” and “Cluniac” are somewhat historically troubled, as scholars (especially in the last fifty years or so) have rightly, and consistently, decried the over-broad use of the term by historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. From their perspective, the uncritical use of “Cluniac” has led to assumptions of the role of “Cluny” in tenth-, eleventh-, and twelfth-century political, theological, and social development that is simply untrue. On the other hand, the broad use of “Cluniac” became ubiquitous among medieval contemporaries of Cluny, even serving metonymically for all “black monks” (Benedictines). My interest here is less concerned with specific monastic involvements and is more interested in a general exegetical trend developing within a monastic system prior to the twelfth century, so I maintain a rather broad definition of “Cluniac” even though most of my discussion will center on the physical site of Cluny specifically. I will employ a similar kind of convention in later chapters where I speak of Cistercians vis-à-vis specific monasteries such as Clairvaux, Rievaulx, or Froidmont. For early discussions of the “Cluniac” issue of name identification (which has been reproduced in most introductions to volumes on Cluny thereafter), see the “Introduction” to Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970). Likewise, Noreen Hunt, “Cluniac Monasticism,” in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Noreen Hunt (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971), 1–10, esp. 2f. For a discussion of Cluny as a “Church System,” see Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion:*

THE FOUNDATION AND THE PROJECT OF CLUNY

When Duke William I of Aquitaine founded Cluny on September 11, 910, he established the monastery for the care of his eternal soul in the hopes of paying off some of the spiritual debt that he had accrued by murder.²³ In contradistinction to typical tenth-century foundational charters which conducted the “gift” while maintaining rights and oversight to the giver, the duke handed over authority of his new monastic house to Saints Peter and Paul (i.e., the papacy) and to the abbot, effectively shifting lay possession back to the regular clergy, a truly novel position in light of established Carolingian regnal policies.²⁴ Unlike earlier houses that followed the *Rule of Benedict*, monks at Cluny did not apportion a period of their day for the conduction of manual labor.²⁵ Rather, adopting the principles set forth in the 817 constitutions developed by Benedict

Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150), trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1998), 31–37.

²³ For a brief history, see Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 26–31.

²⁴ The foundational charter, after enumerating the goods and properties to be handed over, states: “and let the monks themselves, together with all the aforesaid possessions, be under the power and dominion of the abbot Berno, who, as long as he shall live, shall preside over them regularly according to his knowledge and ability. But after his death, those same monks shall have power and permission to elect any one of their order whom they please as abbot and rector, following the will of God and the rule promulgated by St. Benedict—in such wise that *neither by the intervention of our own or of any other power may they be impeded from making a purely canonical election*” [emphasis added by Madigan]; quoted and translated in Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, 121. For more on William’s gift, including the economic and political status of the household and the holdings, see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 2–3, 50–55. Herbert Cowdrey recognizes the medieval and modern perception of novelty associated with William I’s charter, but he argues that Cluniac *libertas* was ultimately the product of subsequent papal privileges granted to Cluny and that the “Foundational Charter must, therefore, be assigned to a relatively undistinguished place in a long history of developments, both before and after it, that went to shape Cluny’s liberty as the eleventh-century reformers praised it”; see, Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, 4–8, here 7.

²⁵ Beginning, famously for the Cistercian-Cluniac debates, with the phrase, “Idleness is the enemy of the soul,” the forty-eighth chapter of the *Rule of Benedict* prescribes season-dependent periods of time for manual labor alongside prayerful reading (*lectio divina*) punctuated by the various liturgical hours performed each day.

of Aniane for Loius the Pious, Cluniac monks conducted their day in ‘perpetual prayer’ (*laus perennis*) “for the welfare of the empire and for the salvation of the living and the dead.”²⁶

These monks identified themselves within Christendom as *oratores*, “those who pray,” a subset of the population that became increasingly stratified and specialized over time. *Oratores*, as “those who pray,” were expected to intercede for *bellatores*, “those who fight,” and, to a lesser extent, for *laboratores*, “those who work.”²⁷ Bishop Adalbero of Laon explored this tripartite structure in a poem that he wrote for the Capetian king Robert the Pious around 1020. In his poem, the bishop relates the three “orders” of people to the three sons of Noah and he describes this organization as essential for social harmony and for peace.²⁸ For Cluniac monks invested in this semi-theological, semi-cosmological system of societal organization, their performance of the liturgy and their continual celebration of Mass represented both their regular act of labor and their contribution to Christian society. Under this conceptual and theological division of labors,

²⁶ Giles Constable, “The Commemoration of the Dead in the Early Middle Ages,” in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. Julia M. H. Smith (Leiden/Boston/Cologne, 2000), 188–95. For the strong intellectual and traditional connection between Benedict of Aniane—through the monasteries of Baume and Gigny—and Berno (first abbot of Cluny, previously abbot of Baume and Gigny), see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 1, 47–49. For a discussion of the aspiration to *laus perennis*, including Cluniac additions to Benedict of Aniane’s liturgical program, see Kassius Hallinger and Noreen Hunt, “The Spiritual Life of Cluny,” in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971), 44.

²⁷ For a quick discussion of this system, see Jacques Le Goff, *Medieval Civilization, 400–1500*, trans. Julia Barrow (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 255. For a deeper consideration of the three orders of medieval society, consider Georges Duby and Arthur Goldhammer, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982). For an exploration of three orders in Carolingian society, see Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 13–16.

²⁸ Le Goff, *Medieval Civilization, 400–1500*, 256.

societal integrity depended upon Cluniac prayers to fulfill a crucial societal need during a period that Jacques Le Goff has called the “time of purgatory.”²⁹

With the liturgy set as the central institution of Cluny and with prayers of the monks acting as the protective and life-giving salve which permitted the *bellatores* to perform their bellicose role, the site of Cluny gained wealth and prestige and continued to expand in order to serve societal and spiritual needs more effectively.³⁰ Under Abbot Odo (second abbot of Cluny, r. 927–942), the Cluniac form of Benedictine monasticism spread across the Christian West, achieving the apogee of its expansion under Abbot Hugh (sixth abbot of Cluny, r. 1049–1109).³¹

²⁹ Le Goff writes that “purgatory as a spatial and temporal entity was formed between the third and the end of the thirteenth century. It was an elaboration of the Christian belief that certain sins could under certain conditions be redeemed after death, a belief that appeared at a quite early date”; Jacques Le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 67.

³⁰ Dietrich Poeck has argued that the associated monasteries and priories of the Cluniac monastic network formed a *congregatio* (a community living within one *coenobium*) rather than an “order” in the way that we describe the Cistercians. Cluny did not become an “order” until the thirteenth century, some time after the scope of this study; see the “introduction” (“Einleitung”) to Dietrich Poeck, *Cluniacensis ecclesia: der cluniacensische Klosterverband (10.–12. Jahrhundert)*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 71 (Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1998), 4.

³¹ Raffaello Morghen and Noreen Hunt, “Monastic Reform and Cluniac Spirituality,” in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 14–15. For a fuller treatment of the life and work of St Hugh, see Noreen Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049–1109* (London: Edward Arnold, Ltd., 1967). For the most comprehensive study of Odo, Cluniac monasticism under the second abbot of Cluny, and the relationship of Cluny to societal developments in the tenth and eleventh centuries, see Isabelle Rosé, *Construire une société seigneuriale: Itinéraire et ecclésiologie de l’abbé Odon de Cluny (fin du IXe–milieu du Xe siècle)*, Collection d’études médiévales de Nice 8 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008). Rosé’s impressive work develops from her earlier *these* entitled, ‘Odon de Cluny (vers 879–942): Itinéraire et ecclésiologie d’un abbé réformateur entre aristocratie carolingienne et monde féodal.’

According to reviewer Scott G. Bruce, Rosé is somewhat weak on the thesis of “construction” but strong in her examination of Cluniac monasticism as a congregation of Benedictine priories attempting to negotiate the difficult time following Carolingian decline; see, Scott G. Bruce, “[Review] Construire une société seigneuriale: Itinéraire et ecclésiologie de l’abbé Odon de Cluny (fin du IXe–milieu du Xe siècle). By Isabelle Rosé. Collection d’études médiévales de Nice 8. Turnhout: Brepols. 2008. 732 pp. €55. ISBN 978 2 503 51835 0,” *Early Medieval Europe* 19, no. 4 (2011): 470.

From around 955 until 981, following Hungarian raids, the original community rebuilt and expanded its central church structure. Majolus, the fourth abbot of Cluny, consecrated the new church on February 14, 981 (now called Cluny II).³² Starting in 1088 under Hugh, the monks at Cluny again expanded the monastery and its church at an enormous, perhaps unrecoverable, cost (now called Cluny III).³³ In addition to the ongoing renovation of its physical plant in Burgundy, the Cluniac network experienced rapid expansion in terms of associated priories, which joined themselves organizationally and institutionally to Cluny within a great monastic system, especially toward the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century.³⁴

As early as the mid-tenth century, papal privileges began to favor Cluniac growth. In 931, Pope John XI granted Cluny the so-called “reception privilege,” which enabled the monastery to receive any monk from any monastery who desired “to transfer to your way of life solely out of zeal to improve his life, that is, to whom his abbot fails to provide the regular

³² The Farfa customary preserves a description of Cluny prior to the death of St Odilo, fifth abbot of Cluny, in 1049 as well as plans (written in the subjunctive) for how the monks hope to renovate the monastery during its final expansion. For an edition and translation of this important document, in addition to a summarizing table for ease of reference, see Jacques Hourlier, “St Odilo’s Monastery,” in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Noreen Hunt (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 58–63. The remainder of Hourlier’s article—pages 59–76—provides a fascinating “tour” of the monastery as a means to interpret and to discuss the information provided by the customary.

³³ The expansion of the monastery known as “Cluny III” has been long considered a significantly contributing factor to the financial decline of the monastery; nevertheless, the renovations would have been most impressive. Kenneth J. Conant, for example, writes that “[Cluny III] represented the monastic achievement in building better than any other edifice”; see, Kenneth J. Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800–1200*, 4th ed. (Yale University Press, 1992), 115. Noreen Hunt discusses some of the symbolic and religious associations of the dimensions of Cluny III, such as the width of the nave (153 feet) being “equivalent to the number of fish in the miraculous draught, a measurement used six times in the old St. Peter’s,” etc. For her findings related to architectural symbolism, see Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049–1109*, 111.

³⁴ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 84–99.

support for repressing the proprietary quality of ownership.”³⁵ Giles Constable has explained that this final phrase (concerning the quality of ownership) indicates that the original purpose of this privilege is best understood within the context of tenth-century reformed monasticism, wherein individual monks may not wish to own property. These monks were meant to return if their parent monastery reformed successfully, however.³⁶ The application of this privilege broadened over time, especially under the support of Pope John XIX in 1024.³⁷

Between the initial “reception privilege” and the final augmentation of this privilege under Pope John, papal policies continually favored Cluniac expansion. In 1016, Pope Benedict VIII extended privileges once afforded only to Cluny to its subordinate priories, and Pope John XIX fulfilled William I’s foundational grant to Sts Peter and Paul by officially exempting Cluny from all episcopal jurisdiction in 1029.³⁸ In the bull *Quoniam abundante* (April 16, 1097), Pope Urban II, himself a former monk of Cluny, further enhanced the spiritual power and autonomy of

³⁵ Hartmut Atsma, Sébastien Barret, and Jean Vezin, eds., *Les plus anciens documents originaux de l’abbaye de Cluny*, Monumenta palaeographica medii aevi. Series gallica (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), I, 33–9, no. 4.

³⁶ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 164f.

³⁷ Pope John officially expanded the privilege granted to Cluny so that the monastery may act as “a bosom of mercy, a port of complete piety and salvation to all those who flee to it for salvation”; *Bull. Clun.* 9AB, *PL* 141, col. 1136D–1137A. Pope Urban II increased the scope of this privilege further still in 1097; see *Bull. Clun.* 31A, *PL* 151, col. 487BD. Constable provides greater depth related to the “reception privilege” than can be discussed here; see *Ibid.*, 163–178.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 24. Between 1033 and 1045, during the reign of Pope Benedict IX, papal privileges extended to Cluny seemed to cease, and the bishop of Mâcon renewed attempts to gain oversight of Cluny. Pope Leo IX in 1046, however, again extended a series of privileges to Cluny in order to facilitate episcopal independence; see, Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, 44–46.

the Cluniac network by granting that Cluny “should not suffer a suspension of holy offices on account of an interdict or excommunication of the neighboring dioceses.”³⁹

Rapid expansion and a centralized organizational system made the liturgically-inclined Cluniac monks a powerful force in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. Their influence proved particularly strong with respect to the liturgy of the dead—the saying of Masses for the expedited release of souls from purgatory—which consumed increasing portions of the monks’ days in liturgical intercession and accompanying charitable activities.⁴⁰ Beginning with those conducted on behalf of the duke and his family, the expansive liturgical celebrations held at Cluny and at its associated communities were increasingly lauded across Europe as a vital tool for the *bellatores*, those for whom war and bloodshed were both daily occurrences and unavoidable sources of accruing years of time in torment after death.⁴¹ One result of this life-giving niche in a period of warring factions was an enormous influx of material wealth that flooded the Cluniac network as feudal lords followed after William I’s hope for salvation.⁴² The

³⁹ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 191; see also, Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, 58–63. This extension of privilege was later confirmed in November 1100 by Pope Pascal II, and it was subsequently confirmed by Callixtus II (1120), by Honorius II (1125), and by Lucius II (1144); see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 192f.

⁴⁰ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 68.

⁴¹ Giles Constable, when reviewing the early documents of Cluny, notes that “only two charters (one of them recording an exchange) make no reference to the eternal welfare of the donors, and it is safe to infer that they all expected some benefit in the next world in return for their grants to Cluny”; *Ibid.*, 5–7, here 6. For a further examination of some of the early Cluniac sources, which demonstrates the overwhelming interest for Cluniac intervention on behalf of the donors’ souls, see Atsma, Barret, and Vezin, *Les plus anciens documents originaux de l’abbaye de Cluny*.

⁴² Cluniac dedication to the liturgy for the dead led to “countless gifts [which] were made to God, the Virgin Mary, and the patron saints and monks of Cluny for the sake of the salvation of the donors and their relatives, and sometimes also of all the dead departed”; Constable, *The*

monks of Cluny, who rather quickly became the caretakers of the wealthiest monastic institution by far in Christian Europe, used these funds to create a physical space reflective of their exegetical program. In other words, they attempted to create the kingdom of God on earth.

MAKING THE SPIRITUAL PHYSICAL: THE KINGDOM OF GOD AT CLUNY

The monastic cloister has a long tradition of being interpreted as a sacred or a semi-sacred space in a profane world, but this conceptualization of space is one that has been negotiated by those inside and outside of the cloistral walls over time. Whether one describes the cloister as a kind of military encampment for soldiers of Christ fighting demons (in which case the notion of the sacred camp extends far back into biblical history⁴³), or one understands the spaces as a tabernacle for God on earth,⁴⁴ or one conceptualizes the monastery as a mass gravesite of the monks therein, it is the composite use of textual and verbal metaphors that

Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation, 65f. Thanks to the admirable work of Joachim Wollasch and others, it is possible to consult Cluniac necrologies from the mid-eleventh century onward (there are no extant necrologies prior) in order to gain a greater appreciation for Cluniac engagement with the repose of the dead; see, Joachim Wollasch et al., eds., *Synopse der cluniacensichen Necrologen, I: Einleitung und Register, II: Die Synopse*, 2 vols., Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 39.1–2 (Munich, 1982). For a review of this important work, see Giles Constable, “Review of Joachim Wollasch, ed., with Wolf-Dieter Hiem / Joachim Mehne / Franz Neiske / Dietrich Poeck, *Synopse der cluniacensichen Necrologen, I: Einleitung und Register, II: Die Synopse* (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 39.1–2), Munich 1982,” *Speculum* 60 (1985): 208–211. For Wollasch’s own discussion of his project, the manuscript witnesses, and the importance of its contribution to the study of Cluniac monasticism, see Joachim Wollasch, “A Cluniac Necrology from the Time of Abbot Hugh,” in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Noreen Hunt (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 143–190.

⁴³ Consider Deuteronomy 23:9, 14: “When you are encamped against your enemies, keep away from everything impure. . . . For the LORD your God moves about in your camp to protect you and to deliver your enemies to you. Your camp must be holy, so that he will not see among you anything indecent and turn away from you.”

⁴⁴ Consider the Prologue to the *Rule of Benedict*: “Brothers, now that we have asked the Lord who will dwell in his tent, we have heard the instruction for dwelling in it, but only if we fulfill the obligations of those who live there. We must, then, prepare our hearts and bodies for the battle of holy obedience to his instructions”; Benedict of Nursia, *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*, trans. Timothy Fry (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1982), 18.

creates and maintains the sacrality of the physical space, sometimes in opposition to perceptions of those dwelling in the “profane” world.⁴⁵ Since sacred space marks an irruption of otherworldly power into profane space, this act of incursive violence requires mediation and the establishment of boundaries between the transformed realm of the sacred and the persistent realm of the profane (or mundane). One way in which “new” sacred spaces may be reconciled to mundane time and place is rather simple: exegetes within the sacred boundaries made recourse to traditionally accepted sacred spaces in order to link the “new” to the “old”, sympathetically and metonymically, and so they purged their cloister of undesired, and potentially hazardous, “novelty.”

In order for the monks of Cluny to fulfill their societal duties of prayerful intercession and spiritual warfare against the encroaching forces of evil, they deemed it necessary to construct a suitable space within which they might celebrate their liturgy with maximal effect. Indeed, both the clergy (secular and regular) and the laity agreed that the perpetual praise (*laus perennis*) offered up by the monks of Cluny was best conducted in a physical space that reflected the holy mysteries performed within its sacred walls. The attempted realization of a spiritual kingdom of God within the confines of a physical space by the monks of Cluny relied upon elements of interpretation drawn from Carolingian-influenced spirituality (e.g., the divinely-inspired kingship model of “David” and of “Solomon” and of “Josiah”) and from then-prevailing “Old Testament”

⁴⁵ See the discussion in Jennifer A. Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” in *From Dead of Night to End of Day: The Medieval Customs of Cluny*, ed. Susan Boynton and Isabelle Cochelin, *Disciplina Monastica* 3 (Brepols, 2005), 134. Harris considers three features assigned to sacred space by Chidester and Linenthal in their introduction to *American Sacred Space*. She writes that “(1) [sacred spaces] are ritually constructed and maintained; (2) they are meaningful, hence interpretable places; and, most important (3) they are contested, generating conflict between different interpreters and claimants to spatial control”; *Ibid.* See further, David Chidester and Edward S. Linenthal, *American Sacred Spaces* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 1–42.

exegetical structures. In terms of the application of the wealth acquired from affluent warlords, this came to include the accumulation and the presentation of things long associated with royal power, such as expensive tapestries, lavish use of artwork, stained glass, items ornamented with jewels and cast in precious metals, etc. In essence, Cluniac exegetes endeavored to establish their houses, the mother house of Cluny especially, as a “bridge” between heaven and earth (one which sought, received, and distributed divine favor) by manifesting the wealth and the glories of heaven in an ostentatious manner for the benefit of a society who saw, in such lavish objects, a true expression of real and divinely-ordained power.⁴⁶

Giles Constable has argued that medieval monasteries such as Cluny often compared themselves both symbolically and literally to Jerusalem.⁴⁷ Likewise, Robert Heath notes that, in the liturgy of Cluny, the monastery is presented “as Jerusalem, the *visio pacis* [vision of peace],

⁴⁶ For example, when writing about the renovations of his predecessor Majolus (Cluny II), St Odilo observes: “Indeed [Majolus’] memory lives on and men hold him blessed as we remember and still behold the fabric of the heavenly building raised by him and by his sons in Christ”; Odilo, *Vita Maioli*: PL 142, col. 946 [trans. by Hourlier, “St Odilo’s Monastery,” 75.]. Jotsald, Odilo’s hagiographer, writes this about Odilo’s renovation projects: “If enemies deride me or friends reprove me for having set down all this unnecessarily, let them know that all these things are signs of the holiness of [Odilo’s] soul, and that for works such as these he both merited the patronage of the saints and has already received in reward a crown of happiness from the Lord... In addition to these virtues of his interior life his outward conduct was marked by glorious zeal for the building and restoration of holy places and for embellishing them with ornaments which he obtained from anywhere he could”; Jotsald, *Vita Odilonis*, 1.13: PL 142, col. 908 [trans. and discussed by Hourlier, loc. cit.]. See also Lekai’s discussion of Cluniac architecture, in Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 261.

⁴⁷ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 30. Kenneth Conant, who has performed definitive work on the excavation of Cluny, argued that the sanctuary of Cluny symbolized the heavenly Jerusalem to that extent that the completed exterior actually looked like medieval symbolic drawings of the Holy City, especially after 1180 when fifteen towers were completed; see Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800–1200*, 115; see also some discussion of Conant’s findings in Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049–1109*, 110.

and is placed symbolically at the center of the Christian world.”⁴⁸ Jennifer Harris notes, alongside Barbara Rosenwein, that, during the period leading to the council of Anse in 994, Cluny began to make increasing claims for its “spatialized sanctity” and for its “privileged status above other monastic communities.”⁴⁹ Harris observes that, in 987, “Mayeul [Majolus], the fourth abbot of Cluny, went to William [of Volpiano] and ‘led him to Cluny, the most sacred of places’ (*ad locorum sanctissimum Cluniacum*).”⁵⁰ Focusing on late tenth and eleventh century customaries, she concludes:

These texts are precocious in their effort to expressed spatialized sanctity in written form. In the customaries and other contemporary documents, we see Cluny being made sacred in its liturgical consecration and by its status as a reliquary site. We are also confronted with the liturgical maintenance of that sanctity in the annual commemoration of the consecration. Finally, we find the daily practices of life at Cluny shaping the very bodies of the monks into sacred places, thus reinforcing the identity of the whole community as locus sanctissimus. ... While similar claims were made by other religious communities, they are most ably articulated in Cluniac customs and practices, and contribute to

⁴⁸ Robert Heath, *Crux imperatorum philosophia: Imperial Horizons of the Cluniac Confraternitas 964–1109*, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 13 (Pittsburgh, 1976), 144–9. Constable and Heath both describe this connection between Jerusalem and Rome, however, both take care to define the connection as one of symbolism rather than identity. This may be due, in part, to the fact that Cluniac language of self-identification gives a sense of superiority to the monastery over and above Rome and Jerusalem in terms of efficacious sanctity. (Jennifer Harris offers a somewhat different position, as I will show. My own position, as it relates to Cistercian connections between monastery and Jerusalem, differs further still, and I will argue that position more fully in the next chapter.)

⁴⁹ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 131. See also, Barbara Rosenwein, “Cluny’s Immunities in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. Images and Narratives,” in *Die Cluniazenser in ihrem politisch-sozialen Umfeld*, ed. Giles Constable, Gert Melville, and Jörg Oberste, *Vita regularis* 7 (Münster: LIT, 1998), 133–63. Also, Barbara Rosenwein, “La question de l’immunité clunisienne,” *Bulletin de la société des fouilles archéologiques et des monuments historique de l’Yonne* 12 (1995): 7. Regarding the council of Anse as it related to Cluniac identity, see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 45f.

⁵⁰ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 131. Quoting from, Rodulfus Glaber, *Rodulfi Glabri historiarum libri quinque et eiusdem auctoris Vita Domni Willelmi Abbatis*, ed. Neithard Bulst, trans. John France and Paul Reynolds, vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 264.

our understanding of the special place Cluny represented in the hopes for building heaven on earth in the eleventh century.⁵¹

Thus, whether one considers archaeological evidence or liturgical evidence, the evidence of interpersonal communications or the evidence of customaries, the general consensus of Cluniac sources indicates that the monks engaged themselves in a program of sacred space construction and maintenance as a core aspect of their spiritual enterprise.

As early as 928, the monks of Cluny had begun to associate (perhaps better, identify) their monastery with Jerusalem and Rome. In fact, the monks promoted Cluny as a viable and even superior alternative to Rome by stating that pilgrims should visit their holy site “for the sake of prayer to the tombs (*limina*) of the holy apostles Peter and Paul.”⁵² Since neither Peter nor Paul was buried at Cluny, Giles Constable argues that the use of the term *limina*, which is the “standard term for the tombs of the apostles in Rome,” most likely referred to the relics of the two saints, some of which were brought to Cluny after its foundation.⁵³

Noreen Hunt likewise discusses the relationship between the Cluniac network of monasteries and the relics of saints held among the priories by arguing that Cluniac monks thrived upon the cult of the saints and lay interest in pilgrimage.⁵⁴ Regarding saintly relics at Cluny (especially the statue of St Peter carried by Cluniac monks during processions), Harris

⁵¹ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 132.

⁵² Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel, eds., *Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de Cluny*, vol. I, Collection de documents inédits sur l’histoire de France (Paris, 1876), 346, no. 367. For the referenced translation, see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 27.

⁵³ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 27.

⁵⁴ She writes: “Cluny became famous as a place dedicated to St Peter and some people regarded it as an integral part of the Roman pilgrimage or as an alternative to Rome when the roads to Italy proved too dangerous”; see, Hunt, “Cluniac Monasticism,” 7–9, here 8.

interprets the presence of these holy objects—referred to as *pignora*—and their “field of sanctity,” as those things which “expand[ed] the nature of the space at Cluny from mere communal place to sacred threshold, with the saints serving to bridge the ontological gap between heaven and earth.”⁵⁵ Bridging the gap between heaven and earth proved important to the Cluniac enterprise because this bridge, established and maintained, provided the necessary avenue through which the monks of Cluny could most effectively intercede on behalf of the souls entrusted to their care.⁵⁶

Odilo of Cluny (962–1049) exemplified Cluniac self-identity when he preached to his brethren that “we who, for the purpose of acknowledging and praising God, by the highest gift of his grace, have been made into peers [*socii*] of the angels.”⁵⁷ As Harris notes, “rites [such as Cluny’s Eucharistic liturgy] propped up the claims made in internal sources, such as the *Lives* of the abbots, that Cluny was indeed the meeting point or threshold between heaven and earth and that the monks were like heavenly angels.”⁵⁸ According to Harris, the annual dedication of the church at Cluny represented and commemorated (via ritual) the ontological identification

⁵⁵ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 138. For more on the material construction of this statue of St Peter, see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 27f. For the term “field of sanctity,” see Ronald Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1977), 26. For a further survey of scholars investigating this conception of Cluniac sanctity, and the idea of Cluny as a “substitute for Rome,” see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 28–29.

⁵⁶ Harris interprets the reliquary bridge as one that both mediates between earth and heaven and is analogized in the extensive liturgy for the dead found at Cluny; see, Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 138f.

⁵⁷ “nos vero qui ad cognoscendum et collaudandum Deum, ipsius dono gratiae, angelis socii effecti sumus...”; Odilo preached this on the feast of the nativity (*De nativitate Domini salvatoris*) (PL 142, col. 991C).

⁵⁸ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 138 n. 40. For her further remarks, see *Ibid.*, 140.

between this church on earth and “God’s dwelling place, the Jerusalem Temple.”⁵⁹ It was within this ritual reenactment that Cluny was maintained as an *axis mundi* and that the monks cultivated their identity with the heavenly angels. During the course of the festival liturgy, readings from Revelation 21 (the “new Jerusalem” passage), alongside antiphonal chants, and eschatological and dedicatory hymns (such as “Blessed City Jerusalem,” *Urbs beata Hierusalem*) entered into concert with each other in order to transform Cluny into Jerusalem.⁶⁰ Moreover, it was through this liturgical concinnity that the connection was maintained throughout the year.

By the time of Abbot Hugh (1049–1109), the basilica at Cluny represented what Noreen Hunt has described as “a unique liturgical background.”⁶¹ During the five principal festivals of the liturgical year—Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Saints Peter and Paul, and the Assumption of Mary—the peals of bells resounded in the ear while the eyes were met with a feast of symbols. Aside from vestments, wall hangings, ornaments in gold and gems, and precious ritual implements, the church was lit by the *corona*, an enormous wheel of jewels and gold that held one hundred and twenty lamps. In addition to this sun-like splendor shining from above, a seven-branched candelabrum eighteen feet tall reminded the monks of the Temple and of the throne room of God in Revelation 4. During the Lenten season, a veil was hung between the

⁵⁹ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 140. See also, Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 217–218.

⁶⁰ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 140–147.

⁶¹ The setting for the liturgical *tour de force* that took place each day at Cluny has been both decried for its elaborate ornamentation (by St Bernard, for example, see below) and championed for its immense beauty (Jean Mabillon in the seventeenth century, for instance, wrote “if you see its majesty a hundred times you are overwhelmed on each occasion”). For Hunt’s interpretation of the church at Cluny, see Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049–1109*, 109. For a specific discussion specific to Cluniac art, see Joan Evans, *Cluniac Art of the Romanesque Period* (Cambridge University Press, 1950).

altar and the choir, the church was suspended in somber anticipation, and only the sacristan was permitted behind the mourning shroud. Liturgical activity strengthened the transformation of the monastery into a sacred space alongside its holy relics and architectural associations to Jerusalem and to Rome because the combination of action and exegesis both created a strong experiential bond among the brethren of the monastery as well as promoted the impression of “holy mysteries” among those restricted to the outside.

Since Cluny was built in stages—and since the records of the Farfa customary and the archaeological efforts of Kenneth J. Conant provide material and textual insight into centuries of development—scholars possess a multiply-attested record of literary and material culture that demonstrates that the Cluniac monks actively and consciously fashioned their monastic space to resemble other sacred city centers through architectural features, artistic depictions, and relic objects.⁶² The physical space was made sacred by corresponding physical constructs which served to create a sympathetic identity in the minds of the monks, the pilgrims, and the donors, all of whom hoped that the presence of Cluny (that is, “Jerusalem”) in their midst would ensure the everlasting repose of their souls in the courts of heaven.

Inside the cloister, Harris identifies the spatial arrangement of the *ecclesia maior* (Cluny II, late eleventh century) as a series of *limina* (here “boundaries” not “tombs”) that “functioned as concentric circles of sanctity that radiated from the sacred center of Cluny, the high altar [dedicated February 14, 981].”⁶³ Within this physical setting, she describes the frequency and the intensity of Cluniac liturgical practice (which consistently linked the Church of Cluny to

⁶² For the Farfa Customary, see Hourlier, “St Odilo’s Monastery,” 58–63 (referenced above). For Conant’s work on Cluny, see Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800–1200*, 185–222.

⁶³ Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 136.

biblical holy places) as an exegetical program meant to sacralize the most sacred ecclesial space and to mark it as distinct from more profane (thus less sacred) spaces such as the monks' living quarters.⁶⁴ Thus, the physical layout of Cluny united to the ritual and liturgical practices of the monks presented an argument for its own sacred identity both to those inside the cloister and to those without (whose entrance was highly restricted), and so the space itself challenged any who might disagree with its holy status with concrete and immovable barriers. Indeed, even the physical placement of the buildings represented a tangible declaration of holiness analogous to the series of courts present at the Temple of Jerusalem (i.e., the Court of the Gentiles, the Court of Women, the Court of Israel, the Court of Priests, the Holy Place, the Holy of Holies) to which Cluny had been united by virtue of the liturgy.

Within the walls of the monastery and in keeping with the metaphor of the temple, Cluniac monks sought to maintain their bodies as sacred vessels, creating, in effect, a microcosm of the rightly ordered, and hierarchical, eschatological society. Harris describes this element of Cluniac sacred space construction as “phenomenological,” and she observes that the daily practices of the monks were intended to transform them into “ritual bodies,” which were “pure” and “sacred places.”⁶⁵ In this regard, she relies upon the well-established fact that the Cluniac organization of priories was highly hierarchical in its structure (both inter-monastically within the network and intra-monastically among the brethren).⁶⁶ She argues that this hierarchical structure, which the monks modeled from the celestial and ecclesiastical hierarchies of [Pseudo]Dionysius the Areopagite, served to reflect the “sacred ordering of all medieval society”

⁶⁴ Ibid., 137–138.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 147, 149.

⁶⁶ For a detailed overview of Cluniac hierarchical organization, see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 113–119.

and that the monks sought to maintain these hierarchies in order that Cluny might parallel God's originally intended cosmological order prior to the Fall and, thus, parallel the order of the eschatological kingdom.⁶⁷ Harris does clarify, however, that the ontological status of the site of Cluny as "sacred" neither depended upon nor required the bodies of the monks (as it will, for example, at Clairvaux).⁶⁸ Nevertheless, these monastic bodies represented the vehicles by which sanctity became dynamic.

As sources from Cluny remain limited to customaries and to other documents which describe the "ideal" state of communal organization, it remains impossible to quantify how successfully some of these exegetical models for the structuring of monastic society may have been. It is possible to conclude, however, that the *perception* of this hierarchical structure among contemporaries of Cluny as prelapsarian and ideal derives from an understanding of the "kingdom of God" that proved predominant in theological texts prior to and during Carolingian

⁶⁷ Harris, "Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as 'Locus Sanctissimus' in the Eleventh Century," 148. For a consideration of the Dionysian hierarchies as they relate to Cluny, see Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 13.

⁶⁸ Harris, "Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as 'Locus Sanctissimus' in the Eleventh Century," 149. I will discuss Harris' qualification between Cluny and Cîteaux in the next chapter. In anticipation of that discussion, however, consider Bernard's words to his monks during the dedication of the church of Clairvaux as a useful contrast. He proclaims: "For what of sanctity can belong to these dead walls on account of which they should be honored with a religious solemnity? They are undoubtedly holy, but it is because of your bodies. For indeed, does anyone doubt that your bodies are holy, which are the temple of the Holy Spirit?" (Quid enim lapides isti potuerunt sanctitatis habere, ut eorum sollempnia celebremus? Habent utique sanctitatem, sed propter corpora vestra. An vero corpora sancta esse quis dubitet, quae templum Spiritus Sancti sunt?) (Bernard of Clairvaux, "First sermon on the dedication of the church" [*In dedication ecclesiae, sermo primus*], in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones II*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 5 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1968), 370f.). See also Harris, "Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as 'Locus Sanctissimus' in the Eleventh Century," 149 n. 99. Iogna-Prat, in a section entitled, "The Church: A Congregation of Believers or a Temple of Stone?", describes developments within Cluniac theology in the mid-twelfth century which began to conceptualize sanctity in terms of community rather than in terms of physical buildings; see, Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 156–181.

rule and that persisted in the broader western Christian religious vocabulary in the years following Carolingian decline. This aspect of Cluniac (sacred) organization is important to bear in mind since Cistercian communities organized their inter- and intra-communal structure according to a different set of social and theological principles. While some hierarchicalization always exists as a necessity of administration, hierarchies were *not* a feature of Cistercian views of eschatological *communitas* and were thus *not* considered an ideal of the textual community. Thus, in order to assess properly the differences between the Cluniac and Cistercian programs of sacred space construction, it is necessary to examine the changing political, theological, and social contexts of the centuries between the foundations of the two communities.

IN CHRIST IS THE NEW CREATION: THE OLD HAS PASSED AWAY, THE NEW IS COME

During the two intervening centuries between the foundation of Cluny in 910 as an independent house, which followed the *Rule of Benedict* as interpreted by the Carolingian Benedict of Aniane and which was subject only to the papacy, and the foundation of Cîteaux in 1098 as a reform Benedictine community, which followed the “original” *Rule of Benedict* “to the letter” and which was aggressively independent from local involvement, medieval western Christendom underwent significant changes as a result of a series of reforms originating from a number of societal strata and impacting most facets of life. As far as the relationship between Cluny and Cîteaux is concerned, the interpretive shift in medieval western Christian consciousness from the “Old Testament” conception of the kingdom of God to the “New Testament” conception of the same will prove the most instructive. In order to understand this shift from “Old” to “New,” ecclesiastical policies of reform and the development of the idea of “crusade” provide the clearest indications of significant theological and exegetical developments.

PAPAL POLICIES OF REFORM AS PRECURSORS TO THE CISTERCIAN “NOVUM MONASTERIUM”

Scholars of medieval history have noted that a number of social, political, and ecclesiastical reforms took place in the decades prior to, during, and just after the eleventh century, and they have assigned these reforms a number of labels and interpretations. Commonly these scholars have labeled ecclesiastical reform policies during this span of time as the “Gregorian Reforms,” citing the papacy of Gregory VII (Cardinal Hildebrand of Sovana, c. 1020–1085) as the principle reforming body. Basing their arguments upon the uniqueness of the foundational charter of Cluny, the importance of Cluniac monasticism during this period, and Gregory’s association with the black monks, historians “once widely believed that the impetus behind the thinking of [these] reformers was monastic, especially Cluniac.”⁶⁹ As Kevin Madigan and others have noted, however, the story of this period is rather more complicated.⁷⁰

Louis Lekai opens *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* by arguing that, as important as the reforming spirit of the eleventh century may have been to the idea of monastic renewal leading to the development of the Cistercian Order, “in fact, contrary to an often expressed belief, Cluniac spirituality had no direct role in launching the Gregorian Reform.”⁷¹ He observes that Peter Damian (1007–1073), friend to Cardinal Hildebrand, criticized the monks of Cluny for

⁶⁹ Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, 123.

⁷⁰ For a survey of various challenges to Cluniac dominance in reform alongside of an account of studies which reconsider the place of Cluny within medieval Christian culture, see Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 43–45; and Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, xiii–xxvii. The formative works linking Cluny to the Gregorian reforms began as early as the late nineteenth century with Ernst Sackur in *Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. (Halle, 1894). Sackur’s position was similar to that of the French Historian Delarc in his study that identified Napoleon as the embodiment of the principles of the French Revolution and Pope Gregory as the embodiment of Cluniac reform; see, O. Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII et la réforme de l’église au XIe siècle* (Paris, 1889), I, esp. x–xxxvii.

⁷¹ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 3.

excessive luxuries that contravened both the letter and the spirit of the *Rule*, and Lekai notes further that Peter demanded reforms based upon principles of poverty, eremitism, and the concept of the *vita apostolica*, the “apostolic life.”⁷² Lekai asserts that the monks of Cluny remained slow to change and reluctant to reform, unwilling to accept that there was a “monastic problem” even as the social, political, and religious landscape changed rapidly around them.⁷³ Their reticence to adapt contributed to the decline of their influence by the twelfth century. Thus, when Madigan observes that “some reformers, like Pope Gregory VII, were essentially men of action, not of contemplation,” and when he argues that “a far more complex understanding of the relation between the ideals and practices of Cluny and those cherished by the papal reformers is required,” his call for “a far more complex understanding” rings true both historically and historiographically.⁷⁴

Reformers of ecclesiastical policies during this period directed their attention especially against simony, or the sale of ecclesiastical offices, and against clerical marriage and concubinage. These were not novel concerns. Eleventh-century prohibitions against these issues held precedents in canon law, and these affronts to ecclesiastical purity were the ongoing subjects of both popular and ecclesiastical concerns over a less-than-holy priesthood. In terms of biblical precedents for these kinds of reform, reformers cited the ideal of *communitas* expressed in the Acts of the Apostles as the exegetical kernel from which their concerns sprung. The Book of Acts, however, proved somewhat ambivalent in its literal sense. While harshly critical of Simon Magus, from whom the term “simony” is derived (cf. Acts 8:9–25), the narrative of Acts does not expressly forbid clerical marriage and, in some ways, seems to undermine such a

⁷² Ibid., 4–5.

⁷³ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁴ Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, 123.

position when one considers that some of the Apostles were, themselves, married. Paul, however, does promote celibacy as the ideal state in 1 Corinthians 7 (vv. 1–7, 36–38) and Jesus is quoted (in Matthew 22:30, for example) as denying marriage at the Resurrection. Thus, despite lacking unequivocal biblical support for some elements of their reform policies, eleventh century reform-minded exegetes presented their case as a return to the *vita apostolica* by virtue of the careful reading and interpretation of key elements of the New Testament, including the life of Christ and the lives of the apostles in Acts.⁷⁵

The social and religious shift from a “Levitical period,”⁷⁶ which existed under the aegis of Old Testament ideals for sacred kingship and for a “kingdom of God” established from the top down through the rightly guided actions of a divinely chosen monarch, to the New Testament ideals of the *vita apostolica*, the ideal of the apostolic community in Acts which was wholly united, socially leveled, and collective in its ownership of property, appears to have developed along several fronts. While one might be inclined, for the sake of symmetry, to interpret the idea of the *vita apostolica* as a kind of grassroots movement that developed at the base of society and moved up the social ranks, this proves too strong a position to take. It does appear that elements of the “New Testament” spirituality marking reform-minded thinking did have its impetus among lower rungs of the socio-political hierarchy; however, high-ranking ecclesiastics also promoted this “testamental” shift for their own, more elite, purposes.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ As Madigan writes, “thus, the reform marks yet another important religio-cultural shift in the western church: the slow eclipse of the Hebrew Bible, with its models for action, codes of conduct, and patterns of worship, and the ascendancy of certain key books of the New Testament, especially those parts believed to represent the life led by Christ and the apostles”; Ibid., 124. See also, Vauchez, *The Spirituality of the Medieval West*, 81–104, esp. 81–88 and 100–104.

⁷⁶ Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, 125.

⁷⁷ Lynch, *The Medieval Church: A Brief History*, 186–192, esp. 187f.

Seeking to wrest back power once voluntarily lost to the Franks some centuries earlier, Church officials used Jesus' promises to Peter as a divine mandate to legitimate papal authority. As far back as late antiquity, the fledgling papacy had used Jesus' declaration, "I say to you that you are Peter, and upon this rock [*petram*], I shall build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it,"⁷⁸ as a divine precedent—indeed a divine mandate—to legitimate the Roman see of Peter during early conflicts over episcopal authority. Now invoking the continuation of Jesus' promise to Peter, "and I give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Whatever you shall bind on earth, will be bound also in heaven: and whatever you release on earth, will be released also in heaven,"⁷⁹ the eleventh-century papacy more strongly asserted its theocratic power in the midst of a tumultuous struggle among feudal lords in the years following Carolingian decline.

Whereas the issues of "simony" and "clerical concubinage" represented concerns within the ecclesiastical structure, the matter of the "Investiture Controversy" reflected the ecclesiastical struggle to assert itself as a global power. Prior to this period of reform, theocracy and divine-chosenness existed as common elements of royal leadership both within the Carolingian "Holy Roman Empire" and among lesser kings and lords. Consider, for example, the coronation prayer of King Edgar of England in 973, which historian of papal law Brian Tierney has described as "similar [to] formulas [which] were used at coronation rites throughout Western Christendom":

O Almighty and everlasting God, Creator and Governor of heaven and earth,
Maker and Ruler of angels and men, King of kings, and Lord of lords, who didst
cause thy faithful servant Abraham to triumph over his enemies; didst give many
victories to Moses and Joshua, the governors of thy people; didst exalt thy lowly

⁷⁸ "Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalerunt adversus eam" (Matthew 16:18).

⁷⁹ "Et tibi dabo claves regni caelorum. Et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in caelis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in caelis" (Matthew 16:19).

servant David unto the height of a kingdom... graciously give ear to our humble prayers, and multiple thy blessings upon they servant N., whom in lowly devotion we do elect to the kingdom... and ever cover him with thy powerful hand, that he, being strengthened with the faith of Abraham, endued with the mildness of Moses, armed with the fortitude of Joshua, exalted with the humility of David, beautified with the wisdom of Solomon, may please thee in all things, may always walk uprightly in the way of righteousness, may nourish and teach, defend and instruct the church of the whole realm of N. with the peoples committed to his charge, and like a mighty king minister unto them the government of they power against all enemies, visible and invisible...⁸⁰

Such prayers of coronation, spoken under the ecclesiastical auspices of the bishop, conveyed upon the king the rights of religious leadership by virtue of the power granted to and identified with key figures of leadership within the Old Testament. The king's power, divinely appointed by God, was further upheld so long as the position of king was regarded as a high-ranking office within the ecclesiastical hierarchy such that the king reigned as both monarch and thearch within his territory. While this pre-reform construction of social hierarchy attempted to ensure a successful rule by uniting the king ritually to favored leaders of biblical history, this act of identification also exalted the monarch above ecclesiastical oversight. This proved problematic for a papacy eager to assert dominion in European politics.

When Pope Leo IX and Emperor Henry III of Germany died within a short period of time of each other (1054 and 1056 respectively), the friendly relations established by the two leaders dissolved during the long minority of the infant Henry IV. During these years, Peter Damian, Humbert of Silva Candida (1015–1061), and Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII) worked to shatter the control feudal lords held upon episcopal investiture. While both Peter and Humbert regarded the shortcomings of church and state with different eyes and with different levels of severity

⁸⁰ Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050–1300: With Selected Documents*, Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 21 (Toronto/Buffalo: Published by University of Toronto Press in association with the Medieval Academy of America, 1988), 30f.

towards clerics involved in such vices as nepotism and simony, both agreed that the Church must wrest power away from lay control.⁸¹ Their position, powerfully championed if not always united, persisted during the papacy of Gregory VII to whom Peter Damian referred as “my holy Satan” with respect to his pursuit of temporal power.

Gregory VII, however, was soon forced to contend with the political aspirations of Henry IV, who had since grown into his position as emperor of the Germans. Waging a battle with both temporal and spiritual ramifications, the two men would most famously clash in 1077 at the castle of the Countess Matilda in Canossa, where Abbot Hugh of Cluny acted as a mediator between the leaders.⁸² The political struggle prompted by ecclesiastical reforms threatened to upset the balance of power among the various governments of western Europe at their most upper echelons, and this clash had an enduring impact within western Christendom. On the other hand, the process of enacting ecclesiastical reforms on the local level, in concert with the rhetoric of reformed holiness captured in the notion of the *vita apostolica*, likewise destabilized the status quo and changed the way in which noble families interpreted their place in society.

For lesser feudal lords, minor nobility, non-inheriting sons, and unwed daughters of the various petty kings scattered across Europe, the reforming spirit of these centuries popularized the decision to enter into a monastic cloister. If inheritance would not be likely, options available to, for example, the second son of a local duke were limited. Since ecclesiastical reforms had now restricted, if not dissolved, local mechanisms of simony and nepotism, the cloister proved a practical option, and the adult decision to enter a monastic community began to

⁸¹ For Tierney’s presentation of Peter Damian’s position vis-à-vis that of Humbert, see *Ibid.*, 33–36.

⁸² For Tierney’s account of Gregory VII’s position on church reform alongside a more detailed narrative of the events at Canossa (including selections of relevant documents), consider *Ibid.*, 45–73.

overtake the earlier practice of child oblation. Within this changing theological and political landscape, the monastic system provided a space into which these disenfranchised noblemen could live a life of some merit. The rising inclination towards the *vita apostolica* proved useful in drawing men into the monasteries wherein they might act as “soldiers for Christ,” fighting off the demons attacking either the world or their individual soul (depending upon the monastic house) and pursuing a path both of individual and of communal salvation.⁸³ Thus, the “Old Testament” to “New Testament” shift of this age of reform began also to transform traditional elements of western monasticism as monastic communities began to draw from a different demographic stratum of the population, from a subset of people who possessed a different set of needs and so inclined towards a different set of religious virtues.

Following the intentions set by their foundational charter, the monks within the now-expansive Cluniac network were rather inclined to accept Gregorian policies designed to sunder the overlapping control that lay lords and secular bishops held, or attempted to hold, over their priories. The more radical elements of reform, which targeted the lay control of ecclesiastical offices (i.e., the issue of investiture), represented a greater problem. The monks of Cluny did not disapprove of lay control over the church (especially since they benefitted from the favor of

⁸³ For a discussion of the “soldiers of Christ” as a changing category of warriors within developing Cistercian houses of the twelfth century, see Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 21–41, and 171–190. Thomas Noble and Thomas Head discuss the idea of the “soldier of Christ” in their edited volume of saints’ lives from Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages; see, Thomas F. X. Noble and Thomas Head, eds., *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints’ Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), esp. xv–xvi.

pious local leaders), they simply asked “lay rulers to exercise their ecclesiastical responsibilities with primary care for the good of the church.”⁸⁴

The relationship between the Cluniac network of monks and the “Investiture Controversy” of the late-eleventh and early-twelfth centuries remains a complex one, and this relationship has been the focus of many erudite scholars of the Middle Ages. As Giles Constable has summarized, “depending on their point of view and the evidence they cite, some [scholars] have maintained that Cluny helped to prepare the way for and supported the reformers; others have said it was neutral; and yet others have argued that it was basically opposed to the reform and committed to the status quo.”⁸⁵ The Cluniac network, while organized, was not a monolith, and the issues of lay and episcopal investiture were not treated in the same way across Europe, so it proves dangerous to make sweeping statements.⁸⁶ Still, it is possible to make tentative, qualified observations concerning the relationship between Cluny and “New Testament”-inspired reforms.

If, in the broadest possible strokes, one considers the importance of the monks of Cluny in the tenth, eleventh, and early twelfth centuries to be equivalent to their societal function as spiritual warriors meant to intercede continually for the well-being of the living and the well-repose of the dead, then we might make a few basic observations about Cluny and reform. First, the foundational charter of Cluny, subsequent chartered gifts, and privileges afforded by ongoing

⁸⁴ Madigan, *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, 123. This is not to imply that the Cluniac position was that of a weakened Church. During this time, a number of men associated with Cluny, such as Otho (Pope Urban II, r. 1088–1099), held high ranks within the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

⁸⁵ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 179. For a survey of the various scholarly positions presented by Constable, see *Ibid.*, 180–181 and especially his notes to these pages.

⁸⁶ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 181.

papal bulls are nearly unanimous in their assertion that the ongoing value of the Cluniac network is inextricably linked to its intercessory function. Moreover, the status of Cluny as an independent entity subject only to Saints Peter and Paul represents a crucial element for universal spiritual efficacy (lest the monks be wholly beholden to a local lord, for example). Thus, from the perspective of lay and ecclesiastical reformers, Cluny represented a useful example of a holy house better able to perform its essential apotropaic and spiritually prophylactic functions because it remained unencumbered; in other words, Cluny modeled the ecclesiastical system as it should be with a purer clergy.⁸⁷ From the perspective of the Cluniac monks, who were both originally removed from lay control and also deeply concerned with the maintenance of cosmologically (and eschatologically) significant hierarchies to transfuse their daily existence, the program of reform leading to the (proper) division of church and state accorded well with their broader exegetical enterprise. Still, since their organizational structure was such that each priory was both partially independent (by geography, if nothing else) as well as partially subject *both* to the needs of the Cluniac organizational hierarchy (and the papacy) *and* to the needs of the local nobles within their respective communities, from whom they drew resources to ensure their daily program of liturgy and prayer, each Cluniac house had a rather complex series of societal, ecclesiastical, and social relations to navigate.⁸⁸

Cluniac involvement within eleventh-century reforms, which was marked with elements of activity, passivity, and indifference, is perhaps helpfully understood as the engagement of one “Church,” or “kingdom”—namely an organization attempting to manifest its version of the kingdom of God on earth in all of its thearchic, hierarchic glory—with two other “kingdoms,”

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ See, for example, the complex negotiations of power among Pope Gregory VII, Abbot Hugh of Cluny (1024–1109), and Henry IV (Hugh’s godson); Ibid., 181–186.

one feudal and the other ecclesiastical.⁸⁹ The monks of Cluny found themselves in an unenviable position: their course of spiritual action lay grounded in an “Old Testament” exegetical model that reform-minded ecclesiastics sought to supersede, and any decision to depart from their established tradition jeopardized both their souls and the souls entrusted to their care. Nevertheless, the changing political and theological landscape threatened to render their existence obsolete if they refused to adapt. Faced with the need to make difficult decisions under the observation of both lay and ecclesiastical leaders, the Cluniac monks were further challenged by the advent of crusade theology, which strongly impacted their claim that the cite of Cluny represented a *locus sanctissimus* rivaling even Jerusalem in holy power.

THE CALL OF CRUSADE AS AN EXPRESSION OF *CHRISTIANITAS*

On November 27, 1095, Pope Urban II preached the First Crusade at the Council of Clermont.⁹⁰ During his appeal to action, the pontiff pleaded for the cessation of warfare among Christians, urged western Christians to travel eastward in order to aid Byzantine Christians undergoing Muslim attacks, and (according to some sources) promised the full remission of sins for any “crusaders” who might die on this armed pilgrimage conducted under the auspices of the cross of Christ.⁹¹ Urban’s call rang out across the medieval West, and the activities of “holy war” would recur at various times, and to varying degrees of success, over the subsequent

⁸⁹ Some scholars have argued that Cluny constituted its own Church in the Middle Ages, essentially separate and distinct from Rome. For a fuller discussion of this *Cluniacensis ecclesia*, see Poeck, *Cluniacensis ecclesia: der cluniacensische Klosterverband (10.–12. Jahrhundert)*, esp. 221–234; also, Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 31–33, 55–68.

⁹⁰ Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1991), 1–2.

⁹¹ For a digest of the sources recording Urban’s sermon, see the compilation in the *Medieval Sourcebook*, <<http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/source/urban2-5vers.html>>.

several centuries.⁹² The idea of crusade must not be understood as one that emerged *ex nihilo* at the end of the eleventh century from the mind of a former monk of Cluny, however.

Herbert Cowdrey has explained that the spiritual concerns of the eleventh century focused upon, with “especial preoccupation... ‘remissio peccatorum’ [the ‘remission of sins’ which] has never been satisfactorily explained by historians,” and he argues that this single-minded obsession with sin and forgiveness both undergirded the rise to prominence and the wealth of institutions such as Cluny, and it reflected the core message of Urban II’s preaching and his call for the crusaders to depart on a mission of peccatorial remission.⁹³ Edward Gibbon memorably described the advent of crusading ideology as “a nerve [that] was touched of exquisite feeling; and the sensation vibrated to the heart of Europe.”⁹⁴

Brian Stock discusses this “nerve” or “sensation” or “obsession” in terms of a kind of cultural vocabulary. He observes that the success of crusading and pilgrimage rhetoric over a wide and disparate European population points to the presence of internal, commonly-held beliefs which served to unite those traveling under the sign of the cross. Thus he writes, following historian Paul Alphandéry, that “the crusade, both in its religious context and its power over the collective life, is present in men’s minds when the actual crusade begins.”⁹⁵ Louis Lekai’s characterization of the crusading spirit reflects a similar perception of crusade as the

⁹² Cole discusses the relationship of the idea of “holy war” to the call for crusade. She writes: “Beginning with St. Augustine’s criteria of a just and allowable war, [Jonathan Riley-Smith] shows how by 1095 canonists had reached a consensus that to be just a war had to have just cause, right intention, and legitimate authorization. But the crusade, while apparently satisfying these criteria, had an important additional element, sanctification by God, and it is this, Riley-Smith concludes, that makes it a holy war;” Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 4.

⁹³ Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, 121.

⁹⁴ Edward Gibbon, *A History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, vol. 4 (London, 1912), 268.

⁹⁵ Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 48.

product of a pervading cultural vocabulary, but he argues that advent of crusader ideology at the end of the eleventh century was tied to the drive towards reform, especially the focus upon the *vita apostolica*. Thus, he writes that “the universal enthusiasm reached its climax in the First Crusade, filling Christian Society as a whole with a heroic zeal for Christ and His cause.”⁹⁶ The point stressed by each of these men is simple: even though the activity of crusade profoundly transformed the political landscape of Europe and the Near East, it emerged as the external manifestation of culturally-driven ideas and concepts that existed already in the interior lives of medieval western Christians.

While Lekai emphasizes that the theological and political vocabulary involved to mobilize troops to reclaim the Holy Land was both universally understood and representative of the climax of the reforming spirit of the century, Brian Stock highlights the degree to which ideas have a pedigree, or a historical genealogy: the idea of crusade does not emerge from a vacuum, but it represents the product of centuries of Christian traditions that consider, support, and emphasize martial action and that strongly resonate with the social and political landscape of western Europe during the warring period following the dissolution of Carolingian control. The notion of martial Christianity draws precedent from Christian history but maintains exegetical support from eschatological speculation. In fact, in order to understand the cultural language that motivated the creation of a temporal “army of Christ” in the Middle Ages, we should look as far back as the Christianization of the Roman Empire.

The ancient story of Constantine’s conversion, begun the night before his major battle at the Milvian Bridge at the prompting of a divine dream and a holy sign (the famous ἐν τούτῳ νικά or *in hoc signo vinces*), proffers only one of many examples of the juxtaposition of Christian

⁹⁶ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 227.

imagery over Roman virtues.⁹⁷ For Romans living during the Republic and the Empire, the hypergood of *virtus*—the quality of manliness and courage exhibited upon the field of battle—encapsulated a central element of right (or “virtuous”) living. This aspect of *Romanitas*, “Roman-ness,” persisted, through co-option and reimagination, during and after the Christianization of the empire, and *virtus* was thus incorporated into the prevailing notion of *Christianitas*, “Christian-ness”. In the period preceding imperial Christianization, the idea of the brave martyr who dies steadfast and “manly” in his faith before Roman opposition reflected the socialized values of the society in which these events were embedded, and stories of these martyrs persisted in the Christian cultural memory. Likewise, the idea of the “athlete of Christ,” who fights bravely for his or her faith both in persecutorial battles within the city and in the battles with the demons of the desert, relies upon the historical virtues of a once-dominant cultural milieu.⁹⁸ So, when Urban II summoned Europe to crusade in 1095, he did so in the language of *virtus* and glory that has pervaded Western culture since the very beginning of the Christian faith and even prior to it.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ For Eusebius’ account of this event, see Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*, chapters 27–32; also translated in Alexander Roberts et al., eds., *Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, Second Series*, vol. 1 (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1990), 489–491.

⁹⁸ The term “athlete,” which carries over from the Greek word *athletes*, derives from *athlos*, a “contest” or a “test.” Gregory Nagy has argued that the connection between wartime feats and feats of athletic prowess is an ancient one, with the identification of the epic hero as an “athlete” being a primary feature of classical poetry; see Gregory Nagy, *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2013), 40.

⁹⁹ Jacques Le Goff describes the beginnings of the crusading spirit as one that served the interests of the Church in its attempt both to control feudal in-fighting and to establish social dominance by means of theological inspiration. In essence, he characterizes the “Crusades” as the papal attempt to direct the love of violence intrinsic to the cultural heritage of the “*Respublica Christiana*” towards goals that served the interests of the Church in its quest for increased temporal power. Le Goff’s argument makes general sense, but his choice to consider all instances of crusade together and to label the whole project as a “failure” is problematic. For a short summary of his position, see Le Goff, *Medieval Civilization, 400–1500*, 69.

In addition to martial values, which I would describe as elements of political theology, Pope Urban relied on exegetical models related to the eschatological kingdom of God in his effort to justify and to promote the creation and deployment of an army meant to retake the holy city of Jerusalem. The reclamation of the city represents a historical event, as Urban directed a military force to engage in a temporal campaign meant to capture a physical location. The language of his preaching, however, correlated this historical activity to the teleological vector of Christian salvation history, which extends from the moment of creation until the eschaton and within which the Holy Land, as the land of Jesus' ministry, and Jerusalem, as the "city of God," play important roles.¹⁰⁰ The city of Jerusalem, then, presented the crusaders with both a physical objective and a spiritual goal.

The language of Urban's sermon made clear that the action of retaking the city was only partially about reclaiming the most holy places for their "rightful" Christian owners; the main impetus of the "army of Christ" was to allow these "mighty men of Christ" to serve valiantly, to die nobly, and to perform acts of great penitence here on earth so that their reward might be greater in heaven. These crusading knights were as much going into battle with the demonic forces overshadowing the current state of the world as they were deploying to war against foreign powers. Consider, for example, Urban's Clermont sermon as "recorded" by Robert of Rheims in his 1107 Chronicle:

From the confines of Jerusalem and the city of Constantinople a horrible tale has gone forth and very frequently has been brought to our ears, namely that a race from the kingdom of the Persians, an accursed race, a race utterly alienated from God, a generation forsooth which has not directed its heart and has not entrusted

¹⁰⁰ For a description of the relationship between Benedictine monasticism and Jerusalem and preaching on the crusades, see Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 6–8.

its spirit to God, has invaded the lands of those Christians and has depopulated them by the sword, pillage, and fire...

Jerusalem is the navel of the world; the land is fruitful above others, like another paradise of delights. This the Redeemer of the human race has made illustrious by His advent, has beautified by residence, has consecrated by suffering, has redeemed by death, has glorified by burial. This royal city, therefore, situated at the center of the world, is now held captive by His enemies, and in subjection to those who do not know God, to the worship of the heathens. ... Accordingly undertake this journey for the remission of your sins, with the assurance of the imperishable glory of the kingdom of heaven.¹⁰¹

Robert's version of Urban's speech makes clear that the crusaders were waging war against a foe both currently threatening and primordially evil in its antagonism towards God and God's will.

Robert, the monk, depicts Jerusalem as an almost mythical sacred land, so blessed by divine favor that cosmology, history, and eschatology intersect. The city sits at the very center of creation, both spatially and ontologically, and it is under attack by the forces of chaos. Urban II called the crusaders to undertake a mission of personal pilgrimage and penitence in order to purify the city even as they purify themselves from encroaching demonic forces, and the entire enterprise is couched in cosmic and cosmological language. Jerusalem is unique because it serves as the *axis mundi par excellence*; it is *the* place that bridges the gap between heaven and earth more fully than any other. As such, the activities of crusade, of so-called "holy war," took

¹⁰¹ Robert of Rheims, *Historia Hierosolymitana* in Edward Peters, ed., *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 27f. A contemporary record of Urban's speech does not exist and Robert's account partially depends upon the *Gesta francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum* ("The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Jerusalemites"), which was written by an anonymous crusader around 1101. Nevertheless, the Benedictine Robert's version most clearly captures the style of thought that I suggest pervades the twelfth-century monastic cloister. In addition, Penny Cole argues that Robert likely was at Clermont and present at Urban's speech even though he wrote his account over a decade later; see, Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 13.

as their objective a space both sacred and profane, holy and mundane. In other words, every action of crusade (so long as it fit within its defined framework) required explanation and justification both in terms of military and political strategy and in terms of exegetical and ecclesiastical efficacy. Every single action represented the product of a two-fold directive, and every single action resulted in a two-fold consequence.

Cluniac Engagement with the Crusader Call

Above I discussed the extent to which Cluniac self-identification held a certain degree of ambivalence for the physical city of Jerusalem, especially with regard to Cluny proper and its central ecclesial structure. On the one hand, the monks of Cluny constructed and renovated their surroundings in such a way that the artwork and architecture of their monastery paid homage to important sites in the Holy Land, and their ritual and liturgical language united the physical space of Cluny to Rome and to Jerusalem in order to argue for the identity of Cluny as a sacred space. On the other hand, art and architecture could, and did, function for the monks as a means of translating the holiness of Jerusalem to the cloister in the same way that their processional reliquary statue of St Peter translated the sacral power of the Roman *limina* to Cluny. By using conceptual synecdoche, which J. Z. Smith described as “transposition,” the part truly became the whole, and the physical existence of Jerusalem in the east remained far less important than its exegetical significance as a site of theophany.¹⁰² Furthermore, the Cluniac liturgy, even as it described its surrounding space as “Jerusalem,” moved beyond the language of equivalence toward the language of supersession: Cluny is Jerusalem insofar as it was a bridge between

¹⁰² Recall Smith’s observation from above that “the activity of *transposition* is one of the basic building blocks of ritual and a central object of ritual thought. The capacity to alter common denotations in order to enlarge potential connotations within the boundaries of the ritual is one of the features that marks off its space as ‘sacred’”; Smith, “Constructing a Small Place,” 18.

heaven and earth rather than a city of the Near East. As a result of the complex exegetical relationship established between Cluny and Jerusalem, it should come as no surprise that the monks of Cluny were likewise somewhat ambivalent to the enterprise of crusade.

Giles Constable notes that the Cluniac network—with its formidable size, wealth, and geographic distribution—served the first crusaders effectively as a kind of bank and trade network in the sense that Cluny acquired land from minor nobles in return for supplies.¹⁰³ Furthermore, early warriors for Christ sought from Cluny what Cluny did best, and these crusaders left their land in the care of the monastic network under the promise that the Cluniac monks would pray for their eternal salvation while they traveled eastward to seek their own brand of martial and martyrial penitence.¹⁰⁴ In terms of direct Cluniac involvement, however, Constable writes the following:

Beyond these few references [i.e., charters trading land for goods] there is no known evidence linking Cluny to the first crusade. No history of the crusade or propagandistic work was written at Cluny or in a Cluniac house, with the possible exception of the so-called encyclical of Sergius IV, which has been linked to Moissac. No manuscript of crusading history was in the library at Cluny.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 197–200.

¹⁰⁴ The penitential system of the centuries leading up to the First Crusade was, following Carolingian influence, heavily embedded within monastic culture, wherein the monastery acted both as an *asylum poenitentium*, a place of refuge for the penitent, but also as a place of continual liturgical intercession designed to support penitents inside and outside of its walls; see, Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, 122–128.

¹⁰⁵ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 200f. Delaruelle remains less charitable than Constable regarding a Moissac-crusade connection. He writes that “Moissac, from its geographical situation looking towards the Pyrenees and Spain, might have served as a springboard for crusading thrusts... It might have been, but our conclusion must be that it was not. It was simply a house of God where in seclusion from the world men devoted themselves to penance, to meditation on the gospel and to the glory of the Father”; Étienne Delaruelle, “The Crusading Idea in Cluniac Literature of the Eleventh Century,” in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Noreen Hunt (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 216.

Adding to the lack of evidence for sustained Cluniac involvement, some scholars, such as Étienne Delaruelle, have argued forcefully both that the notion of the First Crusade was fundamentally at odds with Cluniac ideas of their place in the world with relation to Christian salvation history and that Cluniac monks considered life in the monastery as one of prayer and incompatible with the idea of holy war.¹⁰⁶ This is not to claim that Cluniac interests were wholly spiritual, and Constable does point to a number of individual priories within the Cluniac network which did engage more consistently with various crusader campaigns.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, in light of contemporary scholarship, the general, overarching plan of Cluniac monasticism does not appear to be one particularly inclined to crusade.¹⁰⁸

In terms of Cluniac monks writing about themselves, Jotsald recalls that Odilo (962–1049) once exclaimed, “what need is there to go seeking Christ in the Holy Land? We are in

¹⁰⁶ Étienne Delaruelle, “L’idée de croisade dans la littérature clunisienne du XI^e siècle et l’abbaye de Moissac,” in *Moissac et l’Occident au XI^e siècle*, Actes du colloque international de Moissac 3–5 mai 1963 (Toulouse, 1964), 96f. Delaruelle’s important article also appears in English translation as Delaruelle, “The Crusading Idea in Cluniac Literature of the Eleventh Century,” 191–216. Consider also the work of Ernst Robert Curtius, “Der Kreuzzugsgedanke und das altfranzösische Epos,” *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 169 (1936): 49; of Guy de Valous, “Les monastères et la pénétration française en Espagne du XI^e au XIII^e siècle,” *Revue Mabillon* 30 (1940): 86; of Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, “Cluny and the First Crusade,” *Revue Bénédictine* 83 (1973): 291–4; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, ed. and trans. Marshall Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton, 1977), 329 n. 73; of Hans Eberhard Mayer, *The Crusades*, trans. John Gillingham, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1998), 292, n. 5; and of Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, 323–332.

¹⁰⁷ Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*, 202–208.

¹⁰⁸ This is not to suggest that Clunaic programs within Christian society and Cluniac exegetical positions expressed via sermons, letters, treatises, and the like had no impact on the development of the crusading idea and ideal; Cluny was much too influential to have minimal impact. The argument followed here—similar to the argument that Cluny was not particularly quick to adopt eleventh- and twelfth-century reforms—adopts the perception that Cluny, as an institution, did not incline to promote actively crusading ideas as they developed outside of their control. For a discussion of Cluniac ideas which served as potential precursors to crusading ideologies, see *Ibid.*, 211.

Jerusalem already, a Jerusalem lit up with glory.”¹⁰⁹ Evidence suggests that Odilo’s perception remained fairly standard within the network over time, even after the initial activities of crusade. Again, this is not terribly surprising from the perspective of exegesis and the consideration of sacred space: Cluny does not require the Holy Land for its realization of the “kingdom of God”; if anything, the diversion of troops out of Europe and towards Jerusalem negatively impacted the Cluniac program of sacred hierarchy as it affected their role as *oratores* within a Christian kingdom meant to be ruled by both God and man.¹¹⁰

Medieval historians agree that the programs of reform and the development of crusade ideology and theology, which marked particularly the end of the eleventh century, represented a significant change in the theological, political, and social landscape of medieval Europe. In terms of labels, this shift is often described as the transition from the “early Middle Ages” (once woefully described as the “Dark Ages”) to the “high Middle Ages.” The reform Benedictine

¹⁰⁹ Jotsald, *Vita Odilonis*: PL 142, col. 899; quoted in Delaruelle, “The Crusading Idea in Cluniac Literature of the Eleventh Century,” 211. “Jerusalem lit up with glory” is both an exegetical and a liturgical play on Isaiah 60:1, “Arise, shine, for your light has come, and the glory of the LORD rises upon you.” Aelred of Rievaulx, discussed in Chapter Three, interprets this important passage in his sermon *In apparitione Domini*; see Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, ed. Gaetano Raciti, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 2A–2C (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989), 2B: 38.

¹¹⁰ Delaruelle contrasts the theology of the crusades and the theology of Cluny, and he writes: “The spirituality associated with the crusades is a clearly defined thing, in no way accidental or haphazard but organically related to the whole mystique of the holy war, of which it constitutes both one of the deepest causes and one of the effects. It is a spirituality marked above all by devotion to the passion. The crusader is seeking union with Christ who suffered for mankind, and he dwells on that agony in ways that are often very moving. ... Now this type of spirituality is at the opposite pole to that of contemporary Cluny, for the Cluniac monk concentrated above all on the glorious mysteries. ... The best representative of the Cluniac mentality, however, is once more St Odilo in his sermons. It is not merely that he shows no sign of any special interest in the Holy Land; more significant is the fact that he consistently presents the Christian mysteries in their glorious aspect. In his work the epiphany is not a picturesque scene from Christ’s infancy at the moment of the redemptive incarnation, as it is for the Gothic artists; rather it is a majestic scene, indeed a theophany, to be associated with our Lord’s baptism and the miracle at Cana...”; Delaruelle, “The Crusading Idea in Cluniac Literature of the Eleventh Century,” 209f.

Order of the Cistercians emerged at the end of the eleventh century (1098) when Robert and his “apostles” journeyed to their “holy land” while troops of knights sought to reclaim the “Holy Land” for Christ, but we must be careful to understand the foundation of Cîteaux as a development alongside the ideas of ecclesiastical reform and crusade rather than as a derivative of them.

The “return” to the *vita apostolica* corresponded to a shift in the interpretive focus on the “kingdom of God” away from the Carolingian notion of a divinely-ordered hierarchical society governed by God through an inspired secular ruler. The conflicts over ecclesiastical investiture and other issues endemic in the entrenchment of lay and religious authorities led to a general disinclination towards emphasizing the “kingdom of God” as an expression of divinely-chosen and divinely-guided leadership. Moreover, the idea of the crusade in effect democratized lay access to salvation by providing a massive pilgrimage project, approved by ecclesiastical authority, that permitted *bellatores* to engage in their warlike ways without sole recourse to the *oratores* for the expiation of their bloody debts. In place of a kingdom based on an “Old Testament model” of regal leadership, “New Testament” elements of the kingdom of God as an anticipated eschatological event were highlighted in the rhetoric of crusades and in the general religious fervor of reform. Not surprisingly, the notion of the kingdom of God as one best expressed in *communitas* was developed with particular interest among reform-minded monastic communities, especially the Cistercian Order.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ Jean Leclercq eloquently described the shifting sentiments of reform in the eleventh century when he wrote: “It is difficult to say when this crisis first became apparent. New mental attitudes of any depth or import mature in silence before coming to light. But taking into account all that is revealed by monastic history of the eleventh century, one cannot help seeing that monasticism in traditional Benedictine form, however thriving, austere and beneficent it may have been, no longer satisfied the ascetic aspirations of countless generous souls. Consequently

CÎTEAUX: FELLOW CITIZENS WITH THE SAINTS AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD

Brian Stock argues that the reforms of the eleventh century resulted in greater societal access to literacy and that the rise of a more literate society increased the number of people engaged in the study of texts for the purpose of changing the behavior of individuals or groups. Additionally, he claims that improved literacy led to further interest in reform and to some degree of orthodox religious agitation, to say nothing of communal associations and guilds.¹¹² Thus, Stock understands changes in exegetical foci, social and intellectual reforms, and necessities for restructuring both lay and ecclesiastical leadership as interrelated phenomena, and he concludes that “the impulse toward textual organization in medieval religious movements reached its apogee in the Cistercian Order, founded in 1098. Ornament was reduced to Puritan minimum, liturgy was standardized, and rational planning was introduced into the running of abbeys.”¹¹³

The Cistercian Order, which originated during the concluding years of the Investiture Controversy (as least, during the particular period of time afforded capitalization), would have had—and did have—different theological and organizational perspectives from those of Cluny. For the Cistercians, who did not recognize the “kingdom of God” as a hierarchical society based on principles of proper divine and human leadership, the issue of the Investiture Controversy was rather a non-issue with respect to their program of realizing the heavenly kingdom. Cistercian

other kinds of monasticism arose, not yet institutional in character, or scarcely so; hence the great diversity. But one thing they all had in common—the predominance of the eremitic element, which had been a feature of so many western monastic foundations from the outset”; Jean Leclercq, “The Monastic Crisis of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” in *Clunian Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Noreen Hunt (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 219.

¹¹² Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 23.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 130f.

policy was, from the outset, ideally (if not practically) one of non-involvement with society outside of the cloister.¹¹⁴ Cistercians did not define themselves vis-à-vis prayer for the dead. Cistercians, moreover, were not concerned for the cure of the souls (*cura animarum*) of the local population, as they considered this the domain of bishops.¹¹⁵ The manner in which the secular and ecclesiastical powers engaged with each other, so long as neither infringed upon the Cistercians' own project for perfection, was not of Cistercian concern. For the Cistercian program of realizing the kingdom of God, the endeavors of their community and the actions of each individual within their community was paramount. The Cistercian program of disassociation with secular society, its assignation of episcopal matters to the episcopate, and its depiction of the kingdom of God as a community of believers pursuing the austere path of *communitas* via the *vita apostolica* all differ significantly from Cluny, and all are recognizable features of the eleventh- and twelfth-century reforming spirit into which the community emerged.

A central element of disagreement between Cluniac and Cistercian monks centered upon the monastic liturgy. Specifically, Cistercian perceptions of egregious liturgical pomp and circumstance at Cluny, their disdain for extended periods for prayer at the expense of manual labor, and their aversion to jewels and precious metals for the ornamentation of their cloister correlated to a rather dramatic difference in terms of spatial arrangement and religious

¹¹⁴ This, of course, is not empirically true as the Cistercians were heavily involved in both secular and ecclesiastical politics. To investigate the myriad way in which the Cistercians *did not follow* their own exegetically constructed program for living would be a book-length study by itself. See, for example, Beverly Kienzle's discussion of Cistercian preaching against heresy on the request of the papacy in Beverly Mayne Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229: Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (Rochester: York Medieval Press/Boydell Press, 2001).

¹¹⁵ Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 12.

observance within the Cistercian monastery, a difference which Stock described above as “Puritan minimum.” Lekai has described “the contribution of Cîteaux to the liturgical development of the twelfth century [as] largely a negative one, inasmuch as Cistercians applied consistently the principles of poverty and simplicity in sharp opposition to Cluniac exuberance.”¹¹⁶

Lekai, Stock, and others, who have argued that the Cistercians stripped away various Cluniac embellishments, argue thus with sound recourse to material culture and to primary source texts, but I think that describing Cistercian developments in the “negative” may be fruitfully examined as an exegetical process of juxtapositions. The physical monastery served as a murally-defined liminal space with walls meant to separate monks from their profane past and to keep them waiting in anticipation for their sanctified future. Although the monastic rite of passage was not culminated in life, the liminal cloistral space for the Cistercians represented a place, and a vision, of heavenly anticipation. As a “negative” it expected a future “positive,” the actualization of passage and the realization of this vision. Moreover, in their “negativity”—starkness, lack of adornment, poverty, simplicity, etc.—the walls provided a cleaner canvas in order to paint the transformative exegetical vision of the Cistercians upon each and every element of the cloister.

¹¹⁶ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 254. Lekai continues: “With the exception of a wooden crucifix, any decoration of the sanctuary of the altar was strictly prohibited; the use of precious metals in sacred vessels was eliminated; vestments were made only of linen or wool without any variety of color or quality. The number of daily masses was reduced to one, which was sung after Terce.” Lekai observes that, by around 1225, the restrictions listed here became increasingly lax. While such instances of dissonance between “ideal” and “reality” may be useful to bear in mind, these do not substantially affect the argument presented here. In the case of observing the Cistercian textual community as it relates its story to the arc of Christian salvation history, our concern lies more with Cistercian self-definition (the “ideal”) than it does with a precise account of Cistercian engagements with material culture.

Jean Leclercq's characterization of high medieval monastic life, his notion of the "Jerusalem in anticipation," is one in which the careful digestion (*ruminatio*) of sacred readings (*lectio divina*), the words of divine office, the sounding of psalms, and the sanctification and ritualization of time and space all united in order to transform the monastic space from mundane to supramundane for the members of the community.¹¹⁷ The Cistercian "negative" project, then, represents a paring away of worldly distractions in pursuit of that lofty endeavor. In other words, "Puritan minimum" or "negative liturgical development" is best understood within the context of the exegetical pursuit of the "kingdom of God." It just so happened that the Cistercian "kingdom" looked quite different from the one pursued by the monks of Cluny as a result of changing historical circumstances.

When William of St-Thierry (1080–1148) wrote in his *First Life of Bernard (Vita prima Bernardi)* of Bernard of Clairvaux's experience as a novice at Cîteaux, he emphasized that, even after a year within the cloister, Bernard "still did not know whether the dormitory was vaulted or not or how many windows there were in the apse of the church."¹¹⁸ William's point was not that Bernard lacked natural curiosity but rather that Bernard's devotion to his spiritual quest overwhelmed and mortified his curiosity lest it should distract him. The monastic cloister was

¹¹⁷ Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 56, 73.

¹¹⁸ William of Saint-Thierry, *Vita prima Bernardi* 1.4.20, *PL* 185, col. 238; discussed in Hourlier, "St Odilo's Monastery," 56. In the second book of the *Vita prima*, Arnald of Bonneval writes about Bernard's decision regarding the expansion of Clairvaux in 1135. Bernard is reluctant to change the location of the monastery because he fears that outsiders may think the monks "frivolous and mutable"; see *PL* 185, col. 285A. Alexandra Gajewski discusses the medieval construction of Clairvaux by considering the themes of poverty and austerity presented in Bernard's *Apologia* and in the *Vita prima Bernardi* in her article, "The Architecture of the Choir at Clairvaux Abbey: Saint Bernard and the Cistercian Principle of Conspicuous Poverty," in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honor of Peter Fergusson*, ed. Terryl N. Kinder and Peter Fergusson, *Medieval Church Studies* 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 71–80.

not for the Cistercian Bernard, as it was for the monks of Cluny, an expansive *aide-memoire* designed to reflect key sites of Christian salvation history even as it attempted to realize, in concrete form, the eschatological kingdom. For Bernard, as for other Cistercians, the monastery walls served only as a physical boundary separating the profane space outside from the sacred space within.¹¹⁹

CLUNY, CÎTEAUX, AND THE POLEMICS OF SPACE IN BERNARD'S *APOLOGIA*

Bernard himself discussed the differences between Cluniac and Cistercian architectural space in his *Apologia ad Guillelmum Sancti Theoderici Abbatem* (*Apology to William of Saint-Thierry*), which he wrote in 1125. William, a longtime friend of Bernard, had wished to abdicate his position as abbot of his Benedictine monastery in order to convert to the Cistercian Order, but Bernard enjoined his friend to remain at his post. The *Apologia* forms Bernard's response to William's quest for leading a more perfect monastic life. Although the letter from William prompting Bernard to write the *Apology* is now lost, Bernard's response to William remains. He wrote, in part:

I understand that you want me to convince those who complain that we are slandering the Order of Cluny, that the malicious tale which they believe and spread abroad is not true. ... Perhaps I could say first that the Order itself is quite praiseworthy, and that those who censure it should themselves be censured, and then go on to condemn the excesses present in it.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ "Profane" etymologically derives from *pro fana*: "instead or/in front of the sanctuary."

¹²⁰ Letter 84*bis* in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Tractatus et Opuscula*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 3 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963), 64; Translated and discussed by Jean Leclercq in his introduction to "Cistercians and Cluniacs: St. Bernard's *Apologia* to Abbot William," in Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume I: Treatises I*, ed. M. Basil Pennington (Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1970), 5f.

Thus, the cause for the *Apologia* becomes two-fold: Bernard wrote against Cluny in order to clarify the faults of Cluny in comparison to the Cistercian Order and so to aid William's pursuit of perfection by his presentation of the contrast.

The *Apologia* is a polemical text. As I indicated above, the construction and maintenance of sacred space is, in part, an act of negotiation between those inside and those outside sacred boundaries. In the case of this text, Bernard attacked the sanctity of Cluniac sacred space construction as a means to strengthen Cistercian conceptualizations of their monasteries as sacred spaces. Polemics, of course, are written more for those who agree with the polemicists than for the targets of their vitriol. Still, when Bernard wrote the *Apologia*, he took a certain degree of care in his depiction of his rival monastic organization. Leclercq has suggested that the polemical *Apologia* fits within the genre of ancient satire, "designedly a work in which harsh things are said in order that good may result."¹²¹ So he observed that "the purpose [of writing the *Apologia*] is the serious one of putting an end to a scandal in God's kingdom. The charge that the Cistercians were slandering Cluny must be refuted, and the laxity which had become accepted at Cluny must be denounced."¹²² According to Leclercq's reading of the *Apologia*, Bernard's position is a precarious one: the abbot does not want to make matters worse, but the soteriological stakes are high, and something must be said.

Cistercians rose to prominence as a manifestation of eleventh-century reforming ideals whereas the Cluniac monks lost their former influence as they struggled to adopt to a changing societal landscape. As a result, the antagonism displayed between Cluny and Cîteaux made it

¹²¹ Jean Leclercq, "Introduction" to Bernard of Clairvaux, *Cistercians and Cluniacs: St. Bernard's Apologia to Abbot William*, ed. Jean Leclercq, trans. Michael Casey, Cistercian Fathers Series 1 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1970), 15–23, here 16.

¹²² Jean Leclercq, "Introduction" to Cistercians and Cluniacs: St. Bernard's *Apologia* to Abbot William," in Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume I: Treatises I*, 6.

difficult to imagine that there might be common ground between the two institutions. Yet wiser minds, then and now, recognized nuance and commonalities among the criticisms.¹²³ Bernard, I suspect, was well aware that both members of his order and the monks of Cluny were engaged in the attempt to realize for themselves the kingdom of God on earth; disagreements between the two groups, therefore, were practical and exegetical but so fundamental that Bernard would dare to malign the entire enterprise of Cluny in his criticism of its expression.¹²⁴ The point was never to destroy without offering guidance nor to condemn without affording compassion. Thus Bernard writes the *Apologia* as much as a warning to his own Order concerning the ever-looming danger for excesses as an admonition to the monks of Cluny for their reticence to reform in keeping with emerging policies of austerity and eremitism, which were gaining popularity among reforming monastic congregations.

¹²³ Giles Constable, who edited the letters of Peter the Venerable, including the long letter that Peter wrote to Bernard regarding critiques leveled against Cluny (Letter 28), notes that the twenty instances of disagreement raised and explained in Peter the Venerable's letter to Bernard are a seemingly random mixture of both minor and important points of difference. Constable thinks that Peter's "bitter and exasperated tone" in parts of his reply reflected his position that "in attacking Cluny, the reformers... concentrated on points of detail precisely because there was no serious disagreement on many substantial issues;" Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 185f. Peter addresses the letter to Bernard, but it was likely not Bernard who raised the initial points of contention. Bernard's *Apologia* was written around the same time (likely slightly after) Peter's letter, but the *Apologia* does not respond to the issues raised by Peter. For the full text of this letter to Bernard, which is rather interesting although not terribly relevant to the present topic, see Peter the Venerable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. Giles Constable, vol. 1, Harvard Historical Studies 78 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 52–101.

¹²⁴ As an example of Bernard's tempered response, Leclercq notes that the manuscript tradition of the *Apologia* indicates that there were at least two editions of the text (a "primitive edition" written prior to William's reading and a "definitive edition," which presumably accounts for William's reactions). In the second edition, Bernard occasionally lightens his attack on Cluny, such as in the elimination of a phrase in which Bernard states that he himself bore witness to abuses in the refectory at Cluny (*capitula* 21); see, Jean Leclercq, "Introduction" to *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 10.

In typical Bernardine fashion, the abbot of Clairvaux provides a clear and erudite presentation of his theological and practical disagreements regarding the artistic planning and the architecture of Cluny, and he does so with wit and with skill. He begins his critique in Chapter 28 of the *Apologia* by criticizing the Church at Cluny (the *locus sanctissimus* or the Cluniac “Holy of Holies” considered above). He invokes Persius’ *Satires* (“tell me, O priests...”) for added bite. Bernard writes:

I shall say nothing about the soaring heights and extravagant lengths and unnecessary widths of the churches, nothing about their expensive decorations and their novel images, *which catch the attention of those who go in to pray, and dry up their devotion. To me they seem like something out of the Old Testament;* but let them be, since it is all to the glory of God. However, as one monk to another, may I ask the question which a heathen poet put to his fellows:

“Tell me, O priests,” he said, “why is there gold in the holy place?”

... “Tell me, O poor men,” this is my question, “tell me, O poor men—if you are really poor men—why is there gold in the holy place”? It is not the same for monks and bishops. Bishops have a duty toward both wise and foolish. *They have to make use of material ornamentation to rouse devotion in a carnal people, incapable of spiritual things.* But we no longer belong to such people. ...

Let me speak plainly. Cupidity, which is a form of idolatry, is the cause of all this. It is for no useful purpose that we do it, but to attract gifts. ... It is possible to spend money in such a way that it increases; it is an investment which grows, and pouring it out only brings in more. The very sight of such sumptuous and exquisite baubles is sufficient to inspire men to make offerings, though not to say their prayers. In this way, riches attract riches, and money produces more money. ... Beauty they admire, but they do no reverence to holiness. *That is the reason that churches are decked out, not merely with a jeweled crown, but with a huge jeweled wheel, where circles of lamps compete in radiance with precious stones. Instead of candlesticks we see tree-like structures, made of much metal and with exquisite workmanship, where candles and gems sparkle equally.* Do you think such appurtenances are meant to stir penitents to compunction, or rather to make sightseers agog? Oh, vanity of vanities, whose vanity is rivaled only by its insanity!¹²⁵

¹²⁵ [Emphasis Mine]; Ibid., 63–66. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Apologia ad Guilelmum abbatem*, n. 28: PL 182, col. 914–15; *Tractatus et Opuscula*, 105–106. Also quoted and discussed in Leclercq, “The Monastic Crisis of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” 230. Leclercq notes that

Bernard's critique, that the black monks of Cluny have accumulated both architectural and artifactual wealth in order to impress the laity with earthly possessions as a means for accumulating additional goods, is not inaccurate. Cluny *did*, in fact, build and acquire wealth for the purpose of increasing the perception of their prestige as part of the "Old Testament" model of divine favor.¹²⁶

Bernard rightly apprehended the biblical precedent but failed either to understand or to acknowledge the purpose; in other words, the point of departure between, for example, Odilo and Bernard was not the activity of the Cluny but the interpretation of it. In the Cluniac interpretation of the world and its grand design, the accumulation of goods, land, and holy objects via donation, charter, and pilgrimage remained essential to fashion a physical space that mirrored the rightly ordered kingdom of God; prominent and ostentatious wealth demonstrated divine and royal favor for the monastic project of creating this kingdom and for maintaining the vital sacred bridge that made possible intercession on behalf of the dead. Bernard accused grandiose and elaborate decoration of "drying up devotion," and he attacked the Cluniac monks for failing to be truly "poor men," but these are criticisms born from the reforming spirit that structured the ideologies of his own Order, and these principles of holiness were anachronistic to

"[Bernard's] protests against sculpture and other images inside the monastery were part of a long monastic tradition going back to Cassian [see, *Conferences* X, 5]. His indignation at the immensity of some of the buildings he encountered can be paralleled in the writings of the reformers of every age, and also in hagiography"; Jean Leclercq, "Introduction" to Bernard of Clairvaux, *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 22. For additional sources in the reforming tradition which make claims similar to those of Bernard in the *Apologia*, see Jean Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale. Etapes et constantes* (Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1964), 180–184.

¹²⁶ Lekai rightly explains, as have other scholars of Cistercian history, that Bernard's rejection of the Cluniac form of liturgical, ritual, and aesthetic expressions, which defined the Cluniac version of Benedictine monasticism, does not indicate the absolute rejection of beauty on the part of the Cistercians. Following Bernard's influence, the Cistercians developed their own aesthetic of harmony in simplicity that was designed to promote their ideals of an austere life in pursuit of the kingdom of heaven; see esp. Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 261–270; here 261f.

the organization of Cluny. Simply stated, an order of poor monks (as Bernard would have them) was no more in keeping with the Cluniac perception of the cosmos than an order of wealthy liturgists would have befitted Cistercian ideas of cosmology and eschatology.

Bernard presents the accumulation of wealth at Cluny as simply a means to an end, with that end being further accumulation of lay goods. His cynical response towards the useful and practical value—both spiritual and pedagogical—of all elements of material culture rejected outright the capacity for pilgrims to recognize and to obtain spiritual merit from physical objects. Indeed, Bernard goes so far as to imply duplicity on behalf of the monks for creating and encouraging a scenario in which wealth begets wealth (an event fundamentally at odds with the laws of nature). Bernard's explicit reference to the *corona* at Cluny (the enormous wheel of lamps) and to the “tree-sized” seven-branched candelabrum ignores the obvious and overt religious symbolism of these ritual objects in favor of biting critique.¹²⁷ “Ignores,” perhaps, fails to describe Bernard's action because *he* surely does not fail to recognize the Temple-based and eschatologically-inspired symbolism of the *corona* and the great seven-branched candelabrum; rather, he contends that *others* may remain ignorant of the significance and so be blinded by misdirected ideas of material wealth. While the *Apologia* represents a work of satire, and thus it uses hyperbole and insinuation to make its case, Bernard's attack comes during a period of history within which material wealth was increasingly maligned as a reflection of religious corruption and of avarice rather than of divine favor and of sacred power. Nevertheless,

¹²⁷ As Noreen Hunt noted above, during the abbacy of Hugh, the *corona* was lit only on the five most important festivals of the liturgical year—Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Sts Peter and Paul, and the Assumption of Mary—while a veil was hung between the altar and the choir during the solemnity of Lent; see, Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049–1109*, 109. By the time that Bernard wrote his critique, Peter the Venerable had imposed further restrictions on the periods of fully realized grandeur within the main church of Cluny.

Bernard's criticism presents more a warning than an indictment, as he uses Cluny as a foil to highlight Cistercian protocols of sanctity for William and for other reform-minded readers.

The Cistercian return "to the letter" of the *Rule of Benedict* entailed an explicit rejection of Benedict of Aniane's ninth-century liturgical and monastic reforms. The twelfth-century context of social and ecclesiastical reform, which directed the souls of Christendom towards the *vita apostolica*, stood in direct contrast to the societal vision and organization of Carolingian Europe and the decades following the dynastic decline. Cistercians, such as Bernard, described the activity of their Order as a return to the time of the Apostles, depicting themselves as the rightful heirs to the church of Acts. They found the true expression and manifestation of the kingdom of God, therefore, within the *communitas* of the early Church, and so they strove to join the apostolic brethren as "citizens among the saints and members of the household of God." This vision of the "kingdom of God," both in its present construction and in its eschatological anticipation, did not recognize art, architecture, artifacts, or relics either as essential or even as relevant contributors to its successful realization.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ During Bernard's abbacy at Clairvaux, the strict avoidance of ownership of goods not earned by manual labor and the general refusal towards the acceptance of additional revenue was maintained. As Jean Leclercq and many others point out, however, Cistercian austerity was rather more an ideal than a reality. Nevertheless, the Cistercian internal narrative regarding the place of the Order within the narrative of Christian salvation history is, itself, an idealized account, so we must maintain our contemporary understanding of medieval positivistic history without permitting that data set to distort the internal (mythological) narrative of the Order. For Leclercq's discussion of Cistercian ideals versus reality as these relate to the *Apologia*, see Leclercq, "The Monastic Crisis of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," 231–233. For recent discussions of Cistercian departures from this ideal in art and in architecture, see Diane J. Reilly, "Art," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 125–139; and, Thomas Coomans, "Cistercian Architecture or Architecture of the Cistercians?," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 151–169.

Furthermore, the Cistercian pursuit of sacred citizenship within the *communitas* of their Order did not direct Cistercian attention outside of the cloistral walls in the same way that the Cluniac project of spiritual intervention demanded continued engagement with the laity. Thus, when Bernard writes in this section of the *Apologia* that “bishops have a duty to the wise and foolish” and that “we no longer belong to such people,” he was truly speaking for himself and for his brothers when it came to the enterprise of Cîteaux vis-à-vis Cluny. Cîteaux may have decided to found itself in “places of horror and vast wilderness” for the greater spiritual development of the members of the Order, but this was not the mission of Cluny at the time of Bernard’s critique.¹²⁹ In fact, it never was.

CONTRA CLUNIAC POLEMICS AS A GENRE OF CISTERCIAN SELF-IDENTIFICATION

Bernard’s complex relationship to Cluny, a mixture of admiration, rivalry, and distain, surfaces both in letters to and from the Abbot of Clairvaux, and these mixed reactions recur in the writings of his contemporaries.¹³⁰ The *Apologia* to his friend William of St-Thierry

¹²⁹ Bernard’s critique is among the most articulate, but there were other Cistercian voices joining the “mellifluous Doctor” in criticizing Cluniac excess. For a bibliography of these lesser sources, consider Jean Leclercq, “Une nouvelle réponse de l’ancien monachisme aux critiques des cisterciens,” *Revue bénédictine* 67 (1957): 77–94. The monks of Cluny, moreover, were not altogether obstinate in their view towards contemporary reforms. Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny from 1122 until his death on Christmas day, 1156, initiated a series of reforms (some of which were perhaps inspired by Bernard’s *Apologia*) intended to create a space of increased monastic austerity and eremitism within Cluny; see, Jean Leclercq, “Pierre le Vénérable et l’érémisme clunisien,” in *Petrus Venerabilis 1156–1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of His Death*, ed. Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, *Studia Anselmiana* 40 (Rome: Herder, 1956), 99–120; also, David Knowles, “The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable,” in *Petrus Venerabilis 1156–1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of His Death*, ed. Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, *Studia Anselmiana* 40 (Rome: Herder, 1956), 1–20.

¹³⁰ For examples, consider the controversy over Bernard’s brother Robert’s oblation to Cluny, Bernard’s antagonistic relationship with Peter Abelard, who found refuge at Cluny, and his tenuous “truce” with Peter the Venerable (1092–1156), abbot of Cluny. Idung of Prüfening, writing in the middle of the twelfth century, reproduces Bernard’s letter to Robert as further

represents only one item within a category of twelfth-century writings that contrasted the white and the black monks. A full account of these texts would only belabor the points made by Bernard above, but a brief consideration of one of the last Cistercian entries to the genre of “Cistercians and Cluniacs” may prove instructive. This final *contra* Cluniac text, written by a German monk named Idung of Prüfening around 1155, demonstrates Bernard’s enduring influence on Cistercian self-identification even after his death in 1153.¹³¹

Biographical details of Idung remain scarce, but he depicts himself as an educated adult who entered a Cluniac monastery *ad succurundum*, which is to say “for the care of his eternal soul,” following a period of illness threatening to take his life.¹³² Idung remained for a while as a *conversus* under the Cluniac style of Benedictine monasticism before he decided that the black monks could not fulfill his spiritual needs.¹³³ He then passed over into a Cistercian community with some decree of religious uproar, yet nothing seemed to come of this transgression even though it was discussed in Rome.¹³⁴

proof of the superiority of the Cistercian Order to that of Cluny in *Dialogue* III, 32; see, Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Case for Cîteaux*, trans. Jeremiah O’Sullivan, Cistercian Fathers Series 33 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1977), 119–127.

¹³¹ For a discussion of dating, see the “Introduction” to *Ibid.*, 11. Idung is aware of Bernard’s *Apologia*, which he first references in *Dialogue* I, 14. The ‘Cluniac’ states that Bernard praises the Order and the ‘Cistercian’ responds: “My impression was not unlike yours when I read them for the first time. That should not surprise anybody, because [St Bernard] uses in each that genre of speech [*insinuatio*] which deceives the simple-witted and those who merely skim over what they read”; *Ibid.*, 33.

¹³² Being a member of the monastic order would bode well for the repose of one’s eternal soul; see, Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 6. Idung speaks about his illness and his desire to enter into the monastery for the salvation of his soul in *Dialogues* II, 17–18; *Ibid.*, 71f.

¹³³ *Dialogue* I, 2, in Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 26.

¹³⁴ The action of a monk switching houses was condemned by most Benedictine orders, as the actions of the “wandering monk” are decried in Chapter One of the *Rule of Benedict* and *stabilitas* represents a central monastic vow. As I mentioned above, special dispensation was given to Cluny in order to accept members of other Benedictine houses if the other houses should fail to meet the spiritual needs of their members. Still, this dispensation, and the authority

Idung's "A Dialogue between Two Monks" represents the work of a mature mind having some familiarity with patristic texts (although his use of paraphrase suggests that the copies were not available to him in the Cistercian library), a decent control of legal material (such as Gratian's *Decretum* [1140], Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* [c. 600], and the *Decretum* of Ivo of Chartres [before 1096]), and a penchant for being prickly.¹³⁵ Indeed, Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan, who translated Idung's writings, amusingly observes that "until recently, studies of the *Dialogue* could only speculate how the author had made himself obnoxious to three orders [Benedictines, Canons Regular, and Norbertines]."¹³⁶ The discovery of Idung's *Argumentum super quatuor questionibus* (*An Argument on Four Questions*), within which Idung depicts non-Cistercian orders rather uncharitably, helps to explain the animosity that he felt was directed against him. In the *Dialogues*, Idung defends himself against the charge of the *gyrovagus* (an erstwhile "wandering monk" incapable of *stabilitas*), and he champions the superior observance of the *Rule* within the Cistercian Order.¹³⁷

Representing himself as the 'Cistercian', Idung's primary attack against the 'Cluniac' concerns Idung's assertion that Cluniac customs, as they have developed over time, have supplanted the biblically- and patristically-inspired truths of the *Rule of Benedict*. He describes

behind it, was hotly debated. The fact that these cases and discussions remain known to us (such as the case of Robert, Bernard's brother) and the fact that legal rulings have been made regarding the acceptable instances for monks to change houses both serve to indicate that "order hopping" was a noticeable issue in the Middle Ages. In Idung's case, see *Ibid.*, 6.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 7–9.

¹³⁶ Idung describes himself as having become "obnoxious" in the *Dialogues*, see *Ibid.*, 9. Later in the work he states that he suffers "the righteous hatred of the three Orders," which he feels is undeserved, see *Dialogue II*, 35; *Ibid.*, 83.

¹³⁷ The concern of the gyrovage is raised in Chapter One of *The Rule of Benedict*, where these monks are described as "always on the move, with no stability, they indulge their own wills and succumb to the allurements of gluttony..." (*semper vagi et numquam stabiles, et propriis voluntatibus et gulae illecebris servientes*); *RB* 1.11.

the ongoing evolution of Cluniac customs as “not the Order’s dispensation, but its dissipation.”¹³⁸ Paralleling Bernard’s use of the “poet” in the *Apologia* (that is, the poet says to the priests ... [but] I say to you...), the ‘Cistercian’ argues: “In the Gospel, Christ said to the Jews: ‘You err, not knowing the Scriptures, [Matt. 22:29].’ Begging your pardon, but I can legitimately say to you—and I say it in the compulsion of charity: ‘Brother, you err because you do not know the Scriptures.’”¹³⁹

Idung’s perception of Cluniac activity, especially with regard to their reception of gifts and alms and to their preoccupation with the liturgy for the dead, is considerably more severe than Bernard’s cynical view of Cluniac monks as merely “foolish people.” In fact, Idung’s polemic reads with a tinge of personal vendetta. Citing the words of his contemporary, the Benedictine monk Rupert of Deutz (d. 1129), together with Bede’s *Life of Abbot Fursey*, Idung argues that “monks [who] accept donations from the wicked [do so] to their great peril” and that praying for “him who dies in his sins” sins against himself.¹⁴⁰

Bernard accused Cluniac monks of dabbling in the less spiritual activities of “bishops” to the detriment of their purer purpose, but Idung accuses the monks of Cluny of actively sinning as a result of their traditional intercessory actions. Accusing the monks of Cluny of gathering sin-soaked wealth, Idung’s ‘Cluniac’ understandably pressures the ‘Cistercian’ to explain such a

¹³⁸ *Dialogue* I, 23; Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 37. Idung continues: “The confession of your own lips and the concession in your statement incontestably prove that the Customs of Cluny are a deviation from the law given us by God, that is, from the *Rule*. And thereby they bring dishonor on the giver of the law, that is, on God, and on the expounder of the law, that is, on St Benedict;” *Dialogue* I, 27; *Ibid.*, 38.

¹³⁹ *Dialogue* I, 6; Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 28. Martha Newman describes the “compulsion of *caritas*” as the “weaponized form of charity” among the Cistercians. Bernard, for example, refers to *caritas* as “a lance because, as the Apostle says, everyone who attacks when aroused by charity and does all things in its name fights the war of the Lord”; see, Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 32.

¹⁴⁰ *Dialogue* I, 34; Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 41.

bold charge as the acceptance of “tainted” alms, and Idung mirrors Bernard’s *Apologia* in structure, but he offers a more aggressive response than his predecessor. Idung writes:

CISTERCIAN: Your Order, because it, unlike our Order, did not cut off at the roots the delights of the five senses, receives more because it wants more—not because it needs, but merely because it wants, more.

CLUNIAC: What are these [delights]?

CISTERCIAN: Beautiful paintings, beautiful bas-reliefs, carved [in ivory usually] and each embossed with gold, beautiful and costly cloaks, beautiful hanging tapestries painted in different colors, beautiful and costly [stained glass] windows, blue-colored sheet glass, copes and chasubles with golden orphreys, chalices of gold and precious stones, books illuminated with gold leaf. Necessity and utility do not require all these things, only the lust of the eye does.

CLUNIAC: So that I may hold my tongue about the other items, I ask what more becoming thing can be done than to pay honor to the most holy sacrament of Christ by using the most precious metals?

CISTERCIAN: In his treatise *On the Duties [of the Clergy]* St Ambrose has Christ make a case against a bishop in these words: “‘Why do you allow my poor to perish of hunger?’ The bishop answered: ‘I have given what I have to the poor.’ Christ said to him: ‘Do you have gold?’ ‘Only in your chalice,’ replied the bishop. And Christ answered: ‘My sacraments do not require gold.’” St Jerome in his Letter to Nepotian says: “Either we reject gold together with other superstitions of the Jews, or if the gold is pleasing, the Jews must also be pleasing.” In that very letter in which you say he praised your Order, the abbot of Clairvaux casts aspersions on the same Order when he says with great irony: “*Ask the poor [monks], if they are poor, what gold is doing in their sanctuary.*”¹⁴¹

Idung’s criticism of Cluny, dependent as it is in part to Bernard’s *Apologia*, reflects similar concerns in 1155 as Bernard expressed in 1125. Following Bernard, Idung cites sensual objects—both ornamental and liturgical—as deviations from proper monastic practice and, again following Bernard, the primary point of departure regards the Cistercian concept of apostolic poverty. Idung’s critique is noticeably harsher than Bernard’s, however. Whereas Bernard argued that the regular clergy are held to higher standards than that of the secular clergy because

¹⁴¹ [Emphasis mine]; *Dialogue* I, 36–37; *Ibid.*, 42f.

their heritage lies in the *communitas* of Acts, Idung uses criticisms leveled against bishops by Ambrose and Jerome to argue both that fine ritual objects represent an aberration of the Christian message as a whole *and* that Christ himself decries such a deviation.¹⁴² In other words, the subtle and amusing satire of Bernard (as much corrective as critique) takes on a much more sinister tone in Idung's corresponding "satire."

Bernard's *Apologia* makes clear that, in the Cistercian project of reformed Benedictine monasticism, "negative" physical construction or development was utilized for the creation of a more positive realization of Cistercian monastic ideals. The stark absence of ornamentation (in art, architecture, liturgical objects, etc.) not only better fulfilled the enterprise of the austere *vita apostolica* but also permitted the residents of the cloister to anticipate more perfectly the courts of the heavenly Jerusalem. As Lekai observes, "in the light Bernard's position as expressed in his *Apology* was not motivated by his supposed puritanism, but by his conviction that the house of God and the cloister (*paradisus claustralis*) should be constructed to the likeness of the heavenly Jerusalem, and give a foretaste of its luminous harmony."¹⁴³ Idung's *Dialogue*, written later and after Bernard's death in the middle of the twelfth century, continues to reflect the sentiments of the early Cistercian community insofar as Idung advocates for the removal of ostentation and wealth for the greater pursuit of virtue (as advocated by Christ through his Apostles) and inasmuch as he reflects Bernard's position that the aforementioned materiality distracts the eye and the mind from realizing and dwelling within the Cistercian "New Testament" conception of the kingdom of God. Both Bernard and Idung accurately reflect, as

¹⁴² Idung will later make the case for the apostolic community via a rather extensive quotation of Cassian (*Conferences* 18.5). Idung's use of Cassian appears in a part of the treatise that presents a general discussion concerning the proper definition, configuration, and activity of monks; see, *Dialogue* III, 38; *Ibid.*, 129–131.

¹⁴³ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 263.

elements of their satirical critiques, that Cluny differed from Cîteaux regarding the value and role both of luxurious items—particularly liturgical and ritual items—and of architectural space as conduits for creating the bridge between the “kingdom of God” on earth and the “kingdom of God” in heaven. Moreover, both Cistercians depicted their Order as superseding Cluny. The “New Monastery,” Cîteaux, stands in triumphant contrast to “Old” Cluny.

CONCLUSION: “SO SEEK FIRST THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS”

When asked how best to pray, Jesus taught his followers the words of the *Pater Noster*, which encapsulates Christian hopes for a right relationship with God and a right relationship with their fellow human beings. Beginning the address to the Father in heaven, Jesus first asks that his holy name be sanctified, and then he petitions that the kingdom of God might come and that God’s will might be done on earth as it is in heaven. The Latin version of this prayer—*sanctificetur nomen tuum. adveniat regnum tuum; fiat voluntas tua, sicut in caelo et in terra*—was composed using the subjunctive mood for a number of important reasons. For example, the subjunctive is the appropriate mood for subordinates to maintain while speaking to a superior, such as a monarch, since it expresses the desire and the expectation of a future reality without rising to the verbal force of an imperative demand. Jesus’ principle request, however, is always for the “kingdom of God”—asking, hoping, and expecting that God, in his sovereign majesty, will grant this paramount request—and he reiterates the primary importance of this kingdom later in the Sermon on the Mount when he proclaims, “so seek first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness: and all of these things shall be added on to you,” (Matthew 6:33).

Christian exegetes since Paul have pushed the limits of their interpretive powers in order both to seek insight into the meaning of God’s “kingdom” and to diffuse the uncertainty of not

knowing exactly what that kingdom might entail, especially in light of the many different conceptualizations of the “kingdom of God” offered in the Christian Testaments, both Old and New. The monks of Cluny followed Benedict of Nursia’s *Rule*, which described the monastic cloister in its Prologue as an attempt to build the “tent of God” on earth as a place of education and of preparation for the coming eschatological age. They also followed the principles of a second Benedict, Benedict of Aniane, whose program of monastic reform during the reign of Louis the Pious encouraged an expanded liturgical program in service to western Christian society. Thus, the Cluniac monks, organized and expansive, created a vast network of *oratores*, who used their personal pursuit of holiness to pray for the well being of Christian souls, both living and dead, outside of their sacred cloisters.

Cluny established itself as an effective conduit of spiritual power, a sacred space in medieval Europe wherein divine power irrupted into the world and formed a divine bridge between man and God, by gathering together sacred relics and by constructing a ritual space which aggressively identified itself with the sacred centers of Rome and Jerusalem via architectural features, art, ornamentation, and liturgical objects. Sanctifying time and space with perpetual praise (*laus perennis*), the monks of Cluny sought and constructed the “kingdom of God” by creating a space that was truly sacred within which they might conduct themselves in accordance with the will of God and in pursuit of God’s righteousness. Through their cloister, through its physical and spatial construction and its hierarchical organization, these monks attempted to realize the theocratic kingdom of God championed in the writings of the Old Testament while they eagerly awaited the coming eschaton.

The monks of Cîteaux, seeking out places of “horror and vast wilderness,” acted in accordance with the reforming spirit of the twelfth century from within which they emerged.

Intending to follow the *Rule of Benedict* “to the jot and the tittle,” the monks who left the Benedictine monastery of Molesme along with Robert, Alberic, and Stephen Harding rejected the Carolingian-inspired institutions of Benedict of Aniane, and they rejected the hierarchic and feudally-inspired vision of the monastery as a theocratic society designed after an “Old Testament” model of a holy people/holy priesthood.¹⁴⁴ In their exodus to become a “holy people,” they sought to live as “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God” by recreating the *communitas* of the early church of Acts. Rather than *oratores*, who prayed on behalf of society at large, these monks separated themselves both from the secular clergy and from other members of the regular clergy, who were acting in their traditional salvific societal role, and they fashioned themselves as holy knights and holy priests who used the words of their mouth, the meditations of their hearts, and the work of their hands to effect their personal and their communal salvation. The Cistercians intended to create sacred islands in a profane world, with cloistral walls serving as bulwarks to separate the community from impure influence.

Like the monks of Cluny, the Cistercian textual community sanctified time and space by their actions and by their interpretations of scripture, but, unlike the Cluniac monks, the Cistercians did not afford sanctity to space through the presence of physical objects, such as holy relics, architectural motifs, religious art, or liturgical artifacts. Sacred space, for Cistercian monks, was deeply entrenched and wholly connected to the interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships and experiences that bound the brothers together as one in Christ. To put this

¹⁴⁴ Bede Lackner raises the interesting point that, rather than acting as a reform against Carolingian monastic reforms, “Benedict of Aniane was in some respects a fore-runner of Cîteaux.” His argument follows the line of reasoning that Benedict of Aniane’s reforms and his attempt at restoring the *Rule of Benedict* and raising it to the level of monastic ubiquity led directly to the style of monasticism developed at Cluny. Cluny, in turn, most fully explored the ramifications and implications of the *Rule* and, so, served as the intellectual and spiritual precursor to Cîteaux; see, Lackner, *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux*, 1f.

another way, the Cluniac vocabulary of sacred space tended to be transitive, requiring an extrinsic object for realization, whereas the Cistercian vocabulary tended to be intransitive, relying upon an internalized exegetical framework for interpreting the surrounding monastic cloister. The Cistercian “kingdom of God,” which emerged from the social and theological contexts of twelfth-century reforms, was grounded in *communitas* and built from the common pursuit of the *vita apostolica*, an austere and eremitic lifestyle that sought to emulate Christ and his Apostles. In this way, the Cistercians attempted to “seek first the kingdom of God and God’s righteousness,” by building up their cloisters into holy city in anticipation of the eschatological kingdom lying just over the temporal horizon.

II

Citizens Among the Saints and Members of the Household of God

*Our way of life is in heaven,
from which place we await the savior, Lord Jesus Christ.¹*

For you are no longer guests or visitors, but you are citizens among the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets with Jesus Christ himself as the principal corner stone, in whom the entire building, having been built together, ascends into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built together into a dwelling place of God in the Spirit.²

The medieval monastic project, whether manifested in the opulent splendor of Cluny or in the austere desert of Cîteaux, represented the collective endeavors of men and women who sought to become “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God.” The ways in which these groups pursued that goal, however, depended upon the historical circumstances within which the various communities found themselves.

Early Christians, such as the Apostle Paul and those writing and living in the direct aftermath of Jesus’ life and message, believed themselves to be living at the point when this world would perish and a renewed and eschatological kingdom of God would reign. Indeed Jesus himself was said to teach, “Amen I say to you, that there are those standing here who shall

¹ “Nostra autem conversatio in caelis est unde etiam salvatorem expectamus Dominum Iesum Christum” (Philippians 3:20).

² “Ergo iam non estis hospites, et advenae: sed estis cives sanctorum, et domestici Dei, supraedificati super fundamentum apostolorum, et prophetarum, ipso summo angulari lapide Christo Jesu: in quo omnis aedificatio constructa crescit in templum sanctum in Domino, in quo et vos coaedificamini in habitaculum Dei in Spiritu” (Ephesians 2:19–22).

not taste death until they see the kingdom of God coming in power.”³ John the Baptist, among other wandering prophet-preachers of his day, heralded this powerful sentiment, this notion that the world was on the brink of its end and anticipated renewal, and Jesus likewise presented himself as the harbinger of the end according to the various accounts of the Gospels. Thus, imminent eschatology featured as a central tenet of the earliest communities of believers.

In anticipation of Christ’s impending Second Coming, the church described in Acts could sustain egalitarian *communitas* among its relatively small number of believers. At least, it could for a little while. A small population size and a limited temporal scope permitted the existence of a loose organization of like-minded co-religionists from among the cultural and religious chaos that inevitably results from any rapid dissolution of traditional societal boundaries; that is, from the disruptive and destabilizing belief that “there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female, for all are one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28). Yet the delayed coming of the kingdom of God combined with an increasing number of believers in “Christianity,” and the eventual imperial adoption of this new faith, led to new and unexpected challenges when it came to interpreting, both theologically and exegetically, the meaning of the words of the founder of Christianity, Paul, and the message of the object of Christian devotion, Jesus Christ.

In the first chapter, we considered some of the challenges posed to Christian exegetes seeking to reconcile varying depictions of the “kingdom of God” in the Old and New Testaments. There I argued that medieval monastic communities in the tenth and eleventh centuries, specifically those organized around Cluny, adopted an interpretation of the “kingdom

³ “Et dicebat illis: Amen dico vobis, quia sunt quidam de hic stantibus, qui non gustabunt mortem donec videant regnum Dei veniens in virtute” (Mark 8:39; cf. Matthew 16:28, Luke 9:27).

of God” based upon the “Old Testament” models of the “kingdom” insofar as these monks interpreted the realization of the kingdom of God on earth as the realization of a rightly-ordered and hierarchical society taking its system of governance from the law of God as transmitted through the Bible, through Christian tradition, and through “two Benedicts,” Benedict of Nursia and Benedict of Aniane. The Cluniac network of priories developed a rich and vibrant cloister of liturgical and physical beauty since the monks of Cluny, inspired by their Carolingian predecessors, identified markers of royalty and aesthetic craftsmanship as indicators both of moral goodness and of divine favor.

In this chapter, I will investigate the ways in which the Cistercian textual community, which emerged at the end of the twelfth century, wove together scriptures and tradition in order to maintain their vision of the kingdom of God as a community of believers gathered together by the singular purpose of ascent into God. It is not the case that the Cistercians drew upon new scriptures or new traditions to mark themselves as different from Cluny; rather, the Cistercian textual community read texts held in common to their monastic forbearers in new ways in order to respond to the historical, political, and theological contexts out of which they emerged. I argue that Cistercian monks, like the monks of Cluny, built and maintained their monasteries as sacred spaces into which the divine power of God irrupted in the manner of hierophany and within which the power of God dwelt in the form of the Holy Spirit. Unlike the monks of Cluny, the construction of the Cistercian monastery as a sacred space depended upon communal recognition of the brethren as a sacred community rather than upon any interpretation of the environs as intrinsically or effectively sanctified.

In order to demonstrate that the twelfth-century Cistercian textual community depicted its members as a sacred body of believers whose monasteries were sacred spaces by virtue of the

community itself, I want to discuss three kinds of exegetical texts from within the corpus of Bernard of Clairvaux. First, I want to consider Bernard of Clairvaux's description of Clairvaux as the "heavenly Jerusalem" as it appears in a letter he wrote to a member of the secular clergy (the bishop of Lincoln) outside of his religious order and outside of the walls of his monastery. Second, I will show how Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension of the Lord* depicts a coherent exegetical construction of the monastery as the "heavenly Jerusalem" as Bernard explained it within the monastery to his regular audience. Finally, I will cite examples from Bernard's parables and from his treatise, "In Praise of the New Knighthood" (*De laude novae militiae*), in order to examine monastic texts that exist in, and that make use of, the borderlands between the profane world outside and the sacred world inside the cloister. These final examples will also provide insight into Bernard's use of the language of crusade in its most explicit pedagogical form. In each case let us pay particular attention to Cistercian conceptions of time, history, and eschatology as these relate to the present monastic community and to the advent of the coming kingdom of God.

Jean Leclercq writes that the twelfth century represents the "highpoint of the Middle Ages from the point of view of spirituality," a point of transition when the "predominate influence" upon secular and religious literature shifted from the focus upon "social structures" to the focus upon the individual and the "study of human feelings."⁴ Leclercq describes Bernard of Clairvaux as the "greatest of these" new authors, who "achieved the first great synthesis in the West between all of scriptural and patristic theology on the one hand, and the totality of human experience on the other."⁵ Leclercq's depiction of Bernard offers high praise indeed. The two

⁴ Jean Leclercq, "Introduction," in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 13–14.

⁵ Jean Leclercq, "Introduction," in *Ibid.*, 14.

threads of tradition and experience, which Bernard was able to weave so successfully into his interpretive texts, unite within a deeply contemplative, deeply mystical mind seeking a pathway for the soul to journey into God. In this way, Leclercq rightly observes that later authors, such as St Bonaventure, owe much to Bernard.⁶

ST BERNARD AND THE DEVOTION TO HEAVEN

Bernard, who was born in 1090 in Burgundy, entered Cîteaux during the spring of 1111 while Stephen Harding was serving as the third abbot of the monastery.⁷ In 1115, Bernard and twelve monks (as per Cistercian custom of “apostolic gestation”) traveled north to where he founded and became the first abbot of Clairvaux on land provided by Count Hugh of Champagne about forty miles east of Troyes. Clairvaux, along with the monasteries of Pontigny, Morimond, and La Ferté, would soon rank among the most prominent daughter houses of Cîteaux, and Bernard’s influence quickly came to rival and then to surpass that of his former abbot, Stephen.⁸ Over the course of thirty-five years, the charismatic Bernard was responsible for a great influx of individuals, and even entire families, into the Cistercian “household of God,” establishing 68 additional monastic foundations. By the time of his death on August 20, 1153, about 164 of the 350 now-extant Cistercian houses answered in some degree to the abbot of Clairvaux.⁹ An active theologian, an inspired reader, and a powerful mystical thinker, the first abbot of Clairvaux wrote extensively, producing enough material to fill eight volumes of edited material

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Jean Leclercq, “Introduction,” in Ibid., 15–16.

⁸ Newman writes that Pope Callixtus II granted papal approval to the *Carta caritatis* in 1119. She argues that Stephen Harding created the *Carta* in order to give up most of his direct control over the new Cistercian foundations in favor of binding the daughter houses and their future progeny to Cîteaux by virtue of the common and uniform observance of the *Rule of Benedict* and by some degrees of joint abbatial oversight; see, Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 48–49.

⁹ Jean Leclercq, “Introduction,” in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 17.

in Leclercq's critical edition.¹⁰ This erudite monk remains one of the most engaging figures of the twelfth century, and dozens of modern works—both scholarly and devotional—have been dedicated to exploring the man and his vision of the Church through his manifold works of theology and monastic spirituality.

The twin elements of action and contemplation, captured in the lives of Mary and Martha, marked both Bernard's own character and his program for spiritual progress as it appears in his letters and in his sermons. Concerning his letters, Bernard is thought to have written around one thousand, with about five hundred having been preserved and 225 having been selected and edited by Bernard and his secretary (later Fourth Abbot of Clairvaux), Geoffrey of Auxerre (c. 1115–after 1188).¹¹ Leclercq has described these letters as “epistles, elevated in tone with scriptural allusions, [that] spoke of the spiritual life, stressed motivation and intention, and recalled fundamental truths.”¹² Similar to his letters, the “tone of [Bernard's] sermon was always one of a ‘contemplative discourse,’ teaching the truths of the faith and their effects in the

¹⁰ Bernard's writings are extensive, including theological treatises such as *The Steps of Humility and Pride* (*De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae*), *On Grace and Free Choice* (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*), and *On Loving God* (*De diligendo Dei*), and *On Consideration* (*De consideratione*). He also composed topical works such as the *Apologia* for William of St Thierry, *On the Conversion of Clerics* (*De conversione ad clericos sermo seu liber*) for Parisian ecclesiastics, *In Praise of the New Knighthood* (*De laude novae militiae*) on behalf of the Knights Templar, and the *Life of St Malachy* (*Liber de vita et rebus gestis sancti Malachiae hiberniae episcopi*). Besides these longer works, over 500 letters and close to 400 sermons of Bernard remain extant. In addition to Migne's edition of Bernard's work (PL 182–185), Jean Leclercq, serving as the principal editor, along with Charles H. Talbot and Henri Rochais have created a critical edition of Bernard's work, which may now be consulted in the eight volumes of the *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, published between 1957 and 1977 (Editiones Cistercienses). G. Hendrix added an index biblicus (SBO 9) in 1998.

¹¹ Jean Leclercq, “Introduction,” in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 27. For an English translation of Bernard's letters, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. Bruno Scott James, Cistercian Fathers Series 62 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1998). For an introduction on the letters as a part of Bernard's corpus, see Beverly Kienzle's “New Introduction” in *Ibid.*, vii–xvii.

¹² Jean Leclercq, “Introduction,” in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 27.

Christian life,”¹³ and one may observe that the related genres of monastic letters and sermons reached the pinnacle of their theological heights in the twelfth century among authors such as St Bernard. The sermon especially, as a vessel for theological meaning, represents a wellspring of knowledge about the daily life and ongoing project of the medieval monastery for the modern intellectual historian.

THE SERMON

Unlike the homiletic structure of late antique and early medieval sermons, which treated the biblical lection, or pericope, of the day in a line-by-line, sometimes word-by-word fashion (and unlike thirteenth-century scholastic sermons which employed series of increasingly complex divisions and *distinctiones* to demonstrate the erudition of the preacher), the monastic sermon developed its distinctive style in order to serve best the concerns of the cloister.¹⁴

Characterized by a grounding biblical pericope followed by a citation of the liturgical occasion, the monastic sermon tended towards a tripartite structure within which each section considered a central idea drawn from the lection via one or more of the senses of scripture.¹⁵ Making recourse

¹³ Jean Leclercq, “Introduction,” in *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁴ See Beverly Kienzle, “Introduction,” in Beverly Mayne Kienzle, ed., *The Sermon*, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 81–83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 161–164. See also, Thomas Hall, “The Early Medieval Sermon,” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Kienzle, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 81–83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 203–247. For thirteenth-century innovations, consider the observations of Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, “Statim Invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page,” *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, 1982, 201–225. Also, Phyllis B. Roberts, “Medieval University Preaching: The Evidence in the Statutes,” in *Medieval Sermons and Society: Cloister, City, University: Proceedings of International Symposia at Kalamazoo and New York*, ed. J. Hamesse et al., Textes et études du moyen âge 9 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d’études médiévales, 1998), 317–328.

¹⁵ Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 81–83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 271. Kienzle observes that monastic sermons survive in a number of

to scripture and tradition, the preacher usually offered some sort of moral and pedagogical lesson for implementation in the daily lives of his monks, concluding with a final exhortation and prayer.¹⁶ Beverly Kienzle notes that “the monastic sermon was (and is) generally inward-looking, that is directed to life within the monastery and to the monk’s spiritual progress,” and she states further that “the extant texts provide a guide to monastic spirituality and theology and notes that the sermons occasionally provide a glimpse of problems with the observance of the *Rule*.”¹⁷

Bernard of Clairvaux was a master of the sermon genre, and Bernard’s sermons represent the “longest and most contemplative of his works.”¹⁸ Not only was Bernard a capacious author, whose wide range of topics on monastic and lay spirituality influenced, and continues to influence, Catholic and Protestant religiosity, but the reproduction and transmission of Bernard’s sermons has provided valuable evidence for the process by which the sermon—generally

forms, including “complete texts, reports and *sententiae*, short summaries or outlines containing the major points of the sermon”; Ibid.

¹⁶ Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 281–285, esp. 285. The development of the monastic sermon genre during the high Middle Ages was not solely an invention of the cloister. Michael Signer has argued that both Jewish and Christian communities around the eleventh and twelfth centuries began to shift their exegetical strategies from line-by-line, word-by-word explorations to contextualized examinations of larger sense units embedded within their larger textual substrate; see, Michael Signer, “Restoring the Narrative: Jewish and Christian Exegesis in the Twelfth Century,” in *With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Jane D. McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish, and Joseph W. Goering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 70–82.

¹⁷ Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 271.

¹⁸ Jean Leclercq, “Introduction,” in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 28. Of Bernard’s surviving sermons, one finds 86 on the Song of Songs, 128 liturgical sermons, 125 *On Various Passages*, 17 on *He Who Dwells* (Ps. 90), 4 on *The Annunciation*, 7 parables, or allegorical tales based on scripture, and three series of *Sententiae*, or brief compositions frequently with a simple, numerical structure. For more on Bernard’s sermons, see Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 302–305.

assumed to be an oral “text”—was recorded and sustained as a written text.¹⁹ From the perspective of the present study, both the initial performance of Bernard’s sermons and the sustained memory of his words are important. In Bernard’s case, some of his sermons began as oral texts, subsequently preserved and redacted, and some of his sermons began as written compositions, meant for the instruction of others, for *lectio divina*, or for both.²⁰

If one considers Bernard’s most famous *Sermons on the Song of Songs*, for example, the question as to whether Bernard ever preached these important texts for Cistercian self-identity and for the Cistercian tradition of biblical exegesis has been rather hotly debated. Jean Leclercq analyzed the *Sermons on the Song of Songs* based on a number of criteria, such as style, theological complexity, allusions to monastic life, length, and reference language (e.g., second person plural, first person singular, and first personal plural).²¹ He concluded that the manuscript witnesses do not represent an oral performance. Christopher Holdsworth, however, argues that the rich complexity cannot serve to discredit the oral primacy of a text, and he posited that the *Sermons on the Song of Songs* could have been preached first and that subsequent revision by Bernard may have stripped the sermons of some of their oral markers.²² The designation of a sermonic text as either oral or written is not simply the concern of modern scholars seeking to

¹⁹ For an explanation of the complex redaction process of monastic sermons, along with some discussion of how modern scholars have worked to identify phases of redaction, see Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 288–291.

²⁰ Ibid., 291–295.

²¹ Jean Leclercq, “Were the Sermons on the Song of Songs Delivered in Chapter?,” in *On the Song of Songs*, trans. Kilian Walsh, vol. II, Cistercian Fathers Series 7 (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1976), xv–xxiv. See also, Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 294; and Kienzle’s “Introduction” in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, trans. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Cistercian Fathers Series 53 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1991), esp. 5–15.

²² Christopher Holdsworth, “Were the Sermons of St Bernard on the Song of Songs Ever Preached?,” in *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, ed. Carolyn Muessig, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 90 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998), 315–316.

recreate the relationship between author and text within a *stemma codicum*. The medium of communication—whether oral or written—held significance for medieval audiences as well.

Brian Stock's depiction of the sustaining mechanism behind the "textual community" relies upon the interplay between oral and written "texts." Under his interpretation of the "textual community," the "text" of the community is an evolving corpus that involves both central, traditional, authoritative texts (such as the Bible) and various interpretive and exegetical engagements undertaken by the community. The latter may include elements such as a common rule of life, day-to-day interactions, sermons, authoritative stories, etc., but it remains important for Stock that, over time, some of these quotidian interpretations are elevated to the level of communal "text" such that the authoritative body of scriptures transforms. As the corpus of text transforms, so too does the community responding to the different textual base.²³ Henri de Lubac describes the process of transformation from the daily to the authoritative in his work on *Medieval Exegesis* with respect to the monastic view of the "heavenly Jerusalem." De Lubac observes that "quotidian imagery" used in monastic sermons, letters, and theological treatises unites physical practices to intellectual interpretations of Scripture.²⁴

Tropology represents a crucial mode of exegetical reading when it comes to interpreting the meaning and the importance of "Jerusalem" within its biblical and extrabiblical context. Tropology derives a moral message from a figurative reading, and thus it makes the words of scripture relevant for instruction to the community (both in the concrete and in the abstract) at the same time as it establishes links and bonds between the history of the community and the

²³ See, Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, 90–91. For a specific account of Bernard's involvement in shaping the Cistercian textual community, see *Ibid.*, 405.

²⁴ Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, Ressourcement (Grand Rapids, Mich./Edinburgh: W.B. Eerdmans/T&T Clark, 1998), 2: 127–177, esp. 134–153.

trajectory of Christian salvation history. M. B. Pranger, who specializes in the application of literary theory to the works of Bernard, offers a useful definition of tropological practice:

What happens in the tropology is that in the believer's mind biblical facts and data are appropriated and interiorized so as to create and recreate a world in which the mysteries of faith, lifted out of their original place in history, coincide with the mental state, or, for that matter, development of the believer.²⁵

As Pranger indicates, tropological interpretations served as a kind of exegetical bridge making the past relevant to the present in service to the expectation of future development. The way in which the monks at Clairvaux transformed the monastery into the site of biblical reality represented the product of the communal focus on a particular kind of exegetical thought that developed out of the debate of twelfth-century reform and within the minds of brilliant theological leaders such as Bernard. Additionally, the community-sustaining power of liturgy and ritual bound texts to actions among the brothers of the Order.

That the community was willing and able to pursue this kind of transformative action, which utilized words and ideas to “create and recreate worlds” rather than traditional building materials of wood, stone, gold, and gems, is likewise a product of its historical context and the prevailing desires of the brethren. Put most simply, unlike the Cluniac monks who sought to create a “heavenly kingdom” from which they might care for Christian souls, living and deceased, the Cistercian monks sought to create a “heavenly Jerusalem” from which they might pursue a communal and individual program of ascent into God. As Bernard's secretary Nicholas of Clairvaux would write, “I have poured out my soul in me because I will go to the place of the admirable tabernacle, the house of God. In my view that tabernacle is nothing but the house of

²⁵ M. B. Pranger, “Mystical Tropology in Bernard of Clairvaux,” *Bijdragen, tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 52, no. 4 (1991): 428.

Clairvaux, not made by the hand of men.”²⁶ The ideas among those of Clairvaux seem to accord with one another, but we must consider by what mechanism the web of meaning within this textual community might have extended to each of its members.²⁷

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX AS CREATOR OF “TEXT”

Bernard of Clairvaux’s mystical theology and his exegetical acumen are rightly identified as core elements to the development of the Cistercian Order during the twelfth century. Lekai’s treatment of Bernard not so subtly depicts him as the savior of the Cistercian Order by virtue of his powerful will and his prevailing charisma, and parallels between Bernard and Bonaventure, the Cistercians and the Franciscans, seem evident in the scholar’s mind.²⁸ Berman, whose treatment of the Cistercian “Order” is antagonistic to the idea of any early twelfth-century *ordo* whatsoever, cites Bernard’s nearly overwhelming power and influence as the motivating force behind the composition of the Cistercian “primitive texts,” which emphasize the story of Cîteaux (in contrast to Clairvaux), behind the establishment of a strong Cistercian General Chapter, and thus behind the creation of the *ordo cisterciensis* midway through the twelfth century, *after*

²⁶ “Effudi in me animam meam, quoniam transibo in locum tabernaculi admirabilis usque ad domum Dei. Tabernaculum, Clarevallis domum non manufactam intelligo”; Nicholas of Clairvaux, *Epistula* 35, *PL* 196, col. 1645C; quoted and translated in *Ibid.*, 428f.

²⁷ The question of conveying meaning is especially relevant with respect to the monastic cloister. Henri de Lubac, for example, remained utterly convinced that exegetical developments within the twelfth-century Cistercian cloisters were unique in the history of Christian exegesis of the Bible. The problem he saw, however, concerned the manner by which we, as outsiders, are able to interpret properly these developments. Particularly, he wondered if monastic innovation developed in a way that put it outside of the scope of conformity with tradition and orthodoxy. Ultimately he argued that Cistercian exegesis was, in fact, orthodox. See, Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale; les quatre sens de l’Ecriture*, vol. II (Paris: Aubier, 1959), 582–583.

²⁸ There are a number of instances where Lekai’s history of the Cistercians, especially as it relates to Cistercian poverty and to the *vita apostolica*, presents a thinly-veiled portrayal of the Cistercian Order as the true innovators from which the Franciscan Order might be seen as a later copy. For Lekai’s presentation of Bernard as the “man of the century,” see Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 33–51, esp. 34–36.

Bernard's death. She argues that all of these things occurred in order to wrest dominance away from Bernardine Clairvaux.²⁹ Finally, Brian Stock writes that "no figure in the twelfth century embodies the force of tradition as does St Bernard."³⁰ He was charismatic, authoritative, and the master of the major means of communication of his century, the sermon. The essence of his message was monastic reform through a revival of Benedictine tradition."³¹

Stock defines Bernard's *Sermons on the Song of Songs*, in all of its literary and exegetical brilliance, as the principal and defining text of the Cistercian textual community. The *Sermons on the Song of Songs* defined the "steps" by which the Cistercian soul might climb, first by journeying up to the heavenly city of Jerusalem, then by walking through the courts of the city, and finally by ascending into God by coming into contact—as the bride with her beloved—with God and Christ in the bridal chamber, the Mercy Seat within the Holy of Holies. Leclercq asserts that "all of Bernard's teaching is concerned with the passage from 'flesh' to 'spirit'" and that Bernard maintains throughout his work that "the monk, who performs the duties incumbent on every Christian with total dedication, must try throughout each day to surpass himself, to raise himself to the level of the grace that is already present and active in him."³² The aspiration of ascent, to move up and out of oneself, pervaded the mindset of the monastic cloister in the twelfth century much like the preoccupation with sin and the sullied state of the sinful soul shaped monastic theology in the centuries prior.

²⁹ Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution*, xvii.

³⁰ Stock defines tradition as "a statement of past norms of conduct, not as they were, but as they were thought to be... created by the consciousness of modernity, much in the way that oral culture is set in relief by writing." Concerning Bernard's use of "tradition," he writes that "traditionality is both a force of reformist change and a hegemony of the past, a form of historic nostalgia for an age that is passing away"; Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 166, 169.

³¹ Ibid., 169.

³² Jean Leclercq, "Introduction," in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 38.

Jean Leclercq introduces his discussion of monastic “devotion to heaven” in *The Love of Learning* by observing that “monastic culture of the Middle Ages has two kinds of sources... grammar and spirituality.”³³ Although he does not cite Bernard directly, Leclercq’s words have natural echoes to the opening of the *Sermons on the Song of Songs* wherein Bernard explained to his monks that they must use of the “book of experience” in order to interpret the scriptural “loaves of bread” offered to them for their consumption at the Master’s table.³⁴ Quoting from 1 Corinthians 2:13, “we teach spiritual things to those who are spiritual,” Bernard described the monastic life as one that transforms the written texts of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs into spiritual nourishment for the brothers’ souls. For, having undertaken the Cistercian way of life, they grow in their capacity to understand the richer mysteries of God’s Word.³⁵

The act of preaching within the cloister was both a pedagogical and a liturgical act. Whether the words were derived from the Bible, from the Church Fathers, from Cassian, or from the *Rule*, the sermon represented an essential part of the monastic *scola*, and it served to educate the both young and old monks on their monastic *conversatio* (“way of life”) as the *Rule* requires.³⁶ Furthermore, sermons often became objects of *lectio divina*, the meditative and

³³ Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 53.

³⁴ Cf. Sermons 1 and 3 in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, Sancti Bernardi Opera 1–2 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957), 3, 7. For an English translation of these sermons, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 210–212, 221. Bernard, in a sermon during the rogation days, describes the “three loaves” as “truth, charity, and fortitude”; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 28. For further details on the importance of “bread” as a motif within monastic sermons, see Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 283.

³⁵ Sermon 1.1–4 in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, 3f. Cf. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 210–211.

³⁶ *Rule of Benedict* 57:17–18 describes the procedure for receiving a new brother thus: “Now when he is to be received, in the oratory before all he promises stability (*de stabilitate sua*), the conversion of his way of life (*conversazione morum suorum*) and obedience (*oboedientia*). [This

instructional consumption of religious texts, which punctuated the monastic day.³⁷ The sermon, as an element of the liturgical Hours, represents a sacred act of community building.³⁸ As

Chrysogonus Waddell explains:

The sermon preached in chapter had a liturgical dimension not just because it was based on this or that liturgical text, or because it was preached during the course of a liturgical celebration, but because it was itself a liturgical act, with the preacher breaking the bread received from Christ, ever present and acting through his word.³⁹

According to the *Rule of Benedict*, the monastic vow of obedience likened the Abbot unto Christ himself; thus, each time the abbot spoke in chapter, it was as if the communion of the Upper

takes place] before God and his saints so that he might know that, if he should act in any way otherwise, the one whom he mocks shall surely damn him because of it" (Suscipiendus autem in oratorio coram omnibus promittat de stabilitate sua et conversatione morum suorum et oboedientia, coram Deo et sanctis eius, ut si aliquando aliter fecerit, ab eo se damnandum sciat quem irridit).

³⁷ *Lectio divina* must be understood as both intellectually and spiritually instructive. As Chrysogonus Waddell writes: "Certainly Christ was present and acting every time he [i.e., the monk] sat in the cloister and gave himself to his *lectio divina*, which by its very nature was an exercise in prayer and meditation"; Chrysogonus Waddell, "The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Cistercian Preaching," in *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, ed. Carolyn Muessig, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 90 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998), 335.

³⁸ Waddell offers an interesting and important insight regarding the Cistercian use of the Bible when he observes: "It is remarkable, the extent to which biblical texts used by Cistercian preachers, were taken not directly from the Bible but from the Bible as utilized by the liturgy. I recall Fr Jean Leclercq several times joking to the effect that Bernard never read the Bible"; Ibid., 347. Leclercq's "joke" makes an important point about the Cistercian "textual community" as depicted by theorists such as Brian Stock. "Text" and "scripture" are not static elements of the exegetical web which joined the members of the Cistercian congregations: "text" describes a complex interweaving of text, context, subtext, and intertext expressed in a variety of forms and media which flowed among the monks throughout the daily liturgical experience. Monastic writing, as a result of daily liturgical celebrations, tended to be steeped in quotations from the Bible and from the Church Fathers. For a fuller discussion of this infusion of the Bible into the lives of the religious, consider the recent article by Sister Columba Stewart, "The Use of Biblical Texts in Prayer and the Formation of Early Monastic Culture," *The American Benedictine Review* 62, no. 2 (2011): 188–201.

³⁹ Waddell, "The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Cistercian Preaching," 337.

Room transpired once again with all of its sacramental power.⁴⁰ The successful act of preaching, therefore, represented both a didactic and a mystical experience such that Leclercq may observe: “On the one hand, learning is necessary if one is to approach God and to express what is perceived of Him; on the other hand, literature must be continually transcended and elevated in the striving to attain eternal life.”⁴¹ Bernard’s *Sermons on the Songs*, his most influential work on the Cistercian community, captures this transcendent duality in written form.

Leclercq describes the monastic “devotion to Heaven” as “the most important of the themes to which the monks of the Middle Ages applied literary art.”⁴² This “literary art,” although not defined more fully by Leclercq outside of his discussion of the relationality between text (grammar) and monastic way of life (experience/spirituality), resembles Stock’s discussion of medieval literary theory. Stock describes the written word as “the symbol of the inner, often unconscious, and divinely or diabolically inspired network of sense” from which there “arose the desire for a grammar that could accommodate both literary and social relations.”⁴³ The textual record depicting the relationship between the “book of Scripture” and the “book of experience,” whether this record was expressed as a written or as an oral “text,” reflected the triangular relationship between (historical) text, (present) context, and the individuals of the textual community.

Both Stock and Leclercq draw attention to the fluid sets of relations existing among religious texts—taken as ontologically authoritative within the textual community; oral traditions—understood as functionally authoritative within the textual community; and narratives

⁴⁰ Ibid., 336.

⁴¹ Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 53.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 146.

of individual spirituality—acting as experientially authoritative for each member of the textual community. Each of these “texts,” or “books” as Bernard describes them, influences the members of the (Cistercian) textual community through their ongoing conversation of meaning construction. Thus, when Bernard preached to his congregation, he could speak boldly about the uniquely profound degree of understanding possessed by his audience—those more spiritually elite than others outside of the cloister—because he drew confidence from knowing that the various “texts” of the textual community were working in concert to facilitate meaning. The authority of Bernard’s interpretations, however, directed the manner within which shared meaning took its form.

The related genres of sermon and letter are important for understanding the intellectual history of the religious community because these documents provide a “glimpse” of theological thought processes that were both pedagogically informing and constructively informed by the community within which these texts appeared.⁴⁴ Since an exegete, such as Bernard, wrote and preached in response to the needs of his community, surviving texts encode a tapestry—or a “web”—of ideas woven together out of day-to-day communal concerns, individual theological speculations on related issues, responses to individual and communal needs, and prior exegetical

⁴⁴ For further discussion about the relationship between the genres of the sermon and the epistle, see Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 280. Martha Newman, following Clifford Geertz (*Interpretations of Cultures*, 1973) observes that “an analysis of religious culture provides a partial glimpse into individual minds; even more, it allows us to understand shared meanings—the ‘web of significance’—that exists ‘between the minds’ of the members of a group. An individual’s actions or expressions might influence the religious mentalities of other people, change the connotations of some of their dominant symbols, and help to bind them into a community. At the same time, as members of a community, people create a shared set of meanings through their communications, their actions, and their collective rituals that are related to, but not identical with, each individual member’s religious mentality and articulations of that mentality”; Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 7f.

interpretations which have moved into the position of precedent.⁴⁵ In these documents we find some of our best insights into Bernard's views on "Jerusalem," the kingdom of Heaven.

IN PURSUIT OF JERUSALEM, THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

For Jean Leclercq, the premier motif among the themes of "devotion to Heaven" was that of Jerusalem; he writes:

St. Bernard defines the monk as a dweller in Jerusalem: *monachus et Ierosolmita*. Not that he must be bodily in the city where Jesus died... it is particularly in a place where, far from the world and from sin, one draws close to God, the angels, and the saints who surround Him. The monastery shares Sion's dignity; it confers on all its inhabitants the spiritual benefits which are proper to the places sanctified by the life of the Lord, by his Passion and Ascension, and which will one day see His return in glory.⁴⁶

One notices immediately in Leclercq's description of the monastic pursuit of "Jerusalem" the words of Robert of Rheims in his account of Urban II's call for the Crusade. The language is all but the same.⁴⁷ Robert's monastic preoccupation with Jerusalem as the "kingdom of God" impacted his account of Urban's speech to the potential crusaders at Clermont. The much more difficult question then becomes defining the *mechanism* by which Jerusalem, the "kingdom of God," and the monastery were related.

At Cluny, there was an overt attempt to liken the one (Cluny) to the other (Jerusalem) through architectural and artistic metonymy: elements of constructed and organized space were used to create a holy "cosmos" of sacred sites bound within the walls of the monastery and its

⁴⁵ The etymology of the word "text" contains this notion of weaving thoughts, as "text" derives from *texere* the Latin verb "to weave" and from *textus*, a web or a woven piece of cloth.

⁴⁶ Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 55.

⁴⁷ Recall that Robert wrote, "Jerusalem is the navel of the world; the land is fruitful above others, like another paradise of delights. This the Redeemer of the human race has made illustrious by His advent, has beautified by residence, has consecrated by suffering, has redeemed by death, has glorified by burial. This royal city, therefore, situated at the center of the world..." See, Robert of Rheims, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in Peters, *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, 27f.

church. The monks attempted to construct at Cluny a kind of hyper-realization of the holiness intrinsic to Jerusalem and to the historical and eschatological narratives of the city. Between these artistic and architectural constructions and the gathering together of relics sacred to the original apostolic community, Cluny spatially and exegetically represented “Jerusalem” in a place where Jerusalem was not.

For crusaders going off to war against the enemies of God—whether these enemies were “infidels,” Turks, Saracens, demons or some other hated Other—the sacred site of divine irruption remained an earthly city in the East, which could be approached and captured during the course of an armed pilgrimage. There was no need to create a sacred geography using complex exegetical sympathy: the crusaders simply travelled to dwell in a far-off sacred space in pursuit of their salvation. By capturing a physical municipality possessing spiritual connotations, these warriors waged a battle on two fronts—physical and spiritual—in the hope of securing their reward on the Day of Judgment.

Unlike the monks of Cluny and the crusaders, St Bernard does not seek a “Jerusalem” defined by physical markers of sanctified space; rather, he focuses upon the spirituality of the persons occupying the space, who sanctify and make the space sacred by their presence. For Bernard, theophany occurs when the Holy Spirit descends upon a community united to a holy purpose. This difference must not be trivialized: it is a significant and important departure in the exegetical interpretation of cloistered sacred space that sets earlier monastic accounts (such as those of Cluny, for example) in stark contrast to the interpretations of the twelfth-century Cistercians. Anagogically interpreting a verse from Zephaniah (1:12), “It will come to pass on that day, that I shall search Jerusalem with lamps,” Bernard writes in his *Sermons on the Song of Songs* that “‘Jerusalem’ is the name to designate *those people* who lead the religious life in this

world, imitating the way of life of that Jerusalem up above, by a worthy and well-ordered *conversatio*.⁴⁸ Note that it is not artistic and architectural depictions of the Holy Sepulchre nor scores of holy relics that makes a “Jerusalem”; Jerusalem is Jerusalem because of the “Jerusalemites” (*Ierosolymitae*). In other words, the demonym takes priority: *demos* supersedes *polis*, people over place. Among all of Bernard’s exegetical works, he remains remarkably consistent in his depiction of the monastery as a “Jerusalem” inhabited by “Jerusalemites.” This consistency is maintained both over time and across the physical and interpretive boundaries separating the sacred cloister and the profane world outside. With regard to the latter, we may turn to a letter written by Bernard to Alexander, the bishop of Lincoln, in order to consider the way in which Bernard depicted his community to those outside its holy walls.⁴⁹

MESSAGES FROM HEAVEN: BERNARD’S LETTER ABOUT THE “JERUSALEM” OF CLAIRVAUX

In 1129, after the council of Troyes and just prior to the schism created between Popes Anacletus II (d. 1138) and Innocent II (d. 1143), Bernard found time to write a letter to the bishop of Lincoln on behalf of a young novice named Philip who was seeking to enter the monastery of Clairvaux.⁵⁰ Bernard’s letter to Alexander is both beautiful and complex. As a piece of writing unto itself, it demonstrates Bernard’s mastery of Latin and his strong command of theology, as the text is almost poetical in its structure. The letter is composed from a

⁴⁸ [Emphasis and translation, mine.] “Puto enim hoc loco Prophetam Ierusalem nomine designasse illos, qui in hoc saeculo vitam ducunt religiosam, mores supernae illius Ierusalem conversatione honesta et ordinata pro viribus imitantes” (Sermon 55:2, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, 2: 112.). Also quoted and discussed in Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 55.

⁴⁹ Letter 64 in Leclercq’s edition; James numbers this text as letter 67 in his translation; see, Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, 90–92.

⁵⁰ Alexander sat as Bishop of Lincoln from 1123 until 1147; see, John Mabillon, ed., *Life and Works of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*, trans. Samuel J. Eales, 2nd ed., Catholic Standard Library (London: John Hodges, 1889), I: 245.

masterful weaving together of various biblical passages in service of a theological as well as a social argument. Lekai rightly observed that “the style, vocabulary and imagery of [Bernard’s] writings are so saturated with Biblical references that the understanding and proper evaluation of his thought are impossible without constant recourse to the books of both New and Old Testament.”⁵¹ This letter to the bishop of Lincoln demonstrates Lekai’s observation. Moreover, in addition to its literary and exegetical beauty, this epistle has been the passing subject of a number of studies discussing the idea of the “heavenly Jerusalem” in medieval thought, so it represents an important element for any discussion related to the construction of the monastic cloister as a sacred space representing the kingdom of God in Cistercian thought.

Bernard’s letter for Philip is not particularly long, but Leclercq splits the epistle into three sections in his edition. In the first section, Bernard introduces his reason for writing by describing Philip’s pilgrim journey. Since Philip’s pilgrimage possessed some special features, Bernard provides an account of the trip that has placed Philip under the abbot’s purview. The second section of the letter represents the climax of the exchange: Bernard reveals to Alexander the present state of Philip’s body and soul and, in so doing, he transforms the biography of the lay pilgrim into the story of the monastic pursuit of perfection. In this section, Bernard explains that Philip’s temporary liminal state within the pilgrim-crusader paradigm has been superseded and replaced by the permanent liminality of the monk-saint. In the final section, Bernard redirects the language of liminality and perfection back towards Alexander, reaffirming the superior qualities of the monastic experience while simultaneously admonishing the bishop to care for his soul in light of eschatological expectations. Each section of the letter conveys something about Bernard’s understanding of the Cistercian textual community as it is related to

⁵¹ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 230.

the world, as it is designed for the realization of the kingdom of God within an exegetically-constructed sacred space, and as it is embedded within the narrative of Christian salvation history; thus, each section requires further consideration.

IA: A PILGRIM “SHORT CUT”

To the honorable lord Alexander, bishop of Lincoln by the Grace of God; [from] Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux: may you be honored more greatly in Christ than in the present age!

Phillip, one of your parishioners, desiring to depart for Jerusalem, has discovered a shortcut, and so he came quickly to that which he was wanting.

He set sail in short order across this vast and open sea, and with smooth sailing he has now landed upon the sought after shore, arriving at length to the gate of salvation. ‘Now his feet at standing in the courts of Jerusalem,’ ‘and he worships freely at the footstool of God, about which he had heard in Ephrata, which he found in the field of woods.’⁵²

Bernard begins his description of Philip’s pilgrimage by indicating that Philip has discovered a *compendium viae*, or a “short cut,” to complete his travel to Jerusalem. Rather than signifying a lack of commitment on the part of the traveller, Bernard’s use of “short cut” reflects a particular aspect of Bernardine theology. In fact, Pranger identifies the term “short cut” as the key element to the construction of this letter. He writes: “Philip appears to have taken a short cut (*compendium viae*) both in place and time (*transfretavit in brevi hoc mare*). It is this short cut which enables him to make his *Reise ins Paradies*, to be free from earthly bondage, to extend life

⁵² “Viro honorabili domino Alexandro, Dei gratia Lincolniensi episcopo, Bernardus, abbas Claraevallis: velle honorari magis in Christo quam in saeculo. 1. PHILIPPUS vester, volens proficisci Ierosolymam, compendium viae invenit, et cito pervenit quo volebat. Transfretavit in brevi hoc mare magnum et spatiosum, et, prospere navigans, attigit iam litus optatum atque ad portum tandem salutis applicuit ‘Stantes sunt iam pedes eius in atriis Ierusalem’ (cf. Ps. 121:2), ‘et quem audierat in Ephrata, invento in campis silvae libenter adorat in loco ubi steterunt pedes eius’ (cf. Ps. 132:6–7)”; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 157.

into fantastic dimensions, to come and go with the heavenly citizens.”⁵³ According to Pranger, Bernard uses *compendium viae* both rhetorically and theologically in his writings. Concerning the use of the phrase in this letter, Pranger notes:

After reality has once and for all been condensed in the *verbum abbreviatum*/‘the abridged Word’ spoken by God in the incarnation of Christ, the monastery is the place where this divine ‘short cut’ is rhetorically re-enacted over and over again. Imitating his Lord, the monk makes the same divine movements and stages the same divine performance in one and the same *figura*. In a sense, then, Letter 64 can be said to foreshadow this *figura* which comprises not only Christ in his incarnation but all dynamics of divine rest. It is Christ incarnate, but also the heavenly Jerusalem.⁵⁴

Philip’s discovered “short cut” is not the dereliction of his duties but rather the fulfillment of a higher calling that is described in Scripture and uncovered by exegesis. Notice that the shortcut involves two axes—space and time—and so parallels the monastic exegetical endeavor to sanctify time and space via a spiritualized understanding of the past in pursuit of the realization of a future, eschatological dissolution of time and renewal of space. The Bernardine *compendium viae* is cosmological in nature: it is an act of world-creation.

Bernard describes Philip’s journey to Jerusalem using two verses from the Psalms: Psalm 121:2, “Our feet are standing in your courts, O Jerusalem,” and Psalm 132:6–7, “Behold we have heard of it in Ephrata, we have found it in the fields of the woods. We will enter into his tabernacle, we will worship at his footstool.” Each of these psalms is designated “a song of

⁵³ M. B. Pranger, *Bernard of Clairvaux and the Shape of Monastic Thought: Broken Dreams*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 56 (Leiden/New York: Brill, 1997), 33.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 33f. When Mette Birkedal Bruun discusses this passage, she unites the *verbum abbreviatum* (cf. Romans 9:28) with the idea of the *via regia* from Numbers 20:17 and Numbers 21:22. The “royal road” appears in Origen and in Cassian, and Bernard lauds it for its “straightness” and calls it “the way between joy and the sadness of this life.” Bruun writes that “the short-cut character of *via regia* and the its association with the *verbum abbreviatum* of the Word incarnate is an instance of a spatial term which distends most notions of spatiality; see, Mette Birkedal Bruun, *Parables: Bernard of Clairvaux’s Mapping of Spiritual Topography*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 148 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 97–103, here 98.

ascent,” (*shir hama‘alot* in the Hebrew Bible) or a “gradual canticle” (*canticum graduum* in the Vulgate). The “songs of ascent,” Psalms 119–133, are “pilgrim songs,” songs meant to capture the feeling of traveling to the city of Jerusalem during High Holy Days.⁵⁵ Psalm 121 records a pilgrim prayer for the peace and prosperity of Jerusalem, but Bernard’s primary interest in the scripture seems to concern the image of feet standing (present tense) in the courts of Jerusalem.⁵⁶ The image of “feet” link Philip’s pilgrimage to this psalm and this psalm to Psalm 132.

Psalm 132 is not, based on its plain sense meaning, a song which describes the movement of people on a pilgrimage; rather, the song relates the processional “bringing up” of the Ark of the Covenant into the Temple of Solomon.⁵⁷ The first verses of the psalm (1–5) ask that we remember David, the faithful servant of the Lord, who vowed to build a dwelling place for the Lord.⁵⁸ Verses 6 and 7, quoted by Bernard in his letter, shift the subject. In these verses the

⁵⁵ For more on the psalms bearing the title *shir hama‘alot* see C. C. Keet, *A Study of the Psalms of Ascent: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary upon Ps 120–134* (London, 1972). For a consideration on the difference in titles between these psalms and Psalm 121, which has the title, *shir lama‘alot*, see Mitchell J. Dahood, *Psalms III: 101–150*, Anchor Bible Series 17A (Garden City, 1970), 200.

⁵⁶ There is some evidence that Psalm 121 was originally a “prayer of a warrior” that was adopted as a pilgrim song at some later point in Israelite liturgical development. The older martial elements are not lost on later commentators, however. Bernard of Clairvaux, for example, quotes Psalm 121:3–4 when commenting upon Psalm 91:11 (“For he will command his angels concerning you to guard you in all of your ways”); see Sermon 11 in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super psalmum “Qui habitat,”* ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 4 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1966), 448. For an extended discussion of Psalm 121, see Anthony R. Ceresko, “Psalm 121: A Prayer of a Warrior?,” *Biblica* 70, no. 4 (1989): 496–510.

⁵⁷ John H. Hayes writes: “When David brought the ark to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6), it was with great fanfare and all the features of a solemn religious procession. Psalm 132 recalls David’s promise to find God a dwelling place”; John H. Hayes, *Understanding the Psalms* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 49.

⁵⁸ Although David vows to build a more permanent residence for the Ark in 2 Samuel 7, the prophet Nathan reports to the king that the Lord will invert his vow: rather than David building a house for God, God shall establish a house of David. David’s son, Solomon, will be the builder of the Temple for God (see, 1 Kings 6; cf. 2 Chronicles 3).

promise of David is replaced by a reflection upon the outcome of that promise once the Ark of the Covenant is brought into the Temple built by David's son, Solomon. Verses 8 and 9 conclude the first half of a parallel structure, and the Lord with his Ark is brought into the Temple for divine service: "Arise, O Lord, in your resting place, You and the Ark of your great glory; your priests are clothed in righteousness, and your saints exult!"⁵⁹ Psalm 132:10–18 represents a nine-verse recapitulation of the first nine verses of the psalm. The psalmist has used parallelism for emphasis, a common literary device in biblical poetry. First the psalmist remembers David and his oath (10–11); next he focuses upon the Lord and his chosen resting place, culminating this section in the institution of divine offices (12–16); he concludes the psalm with the hope for divine protection (17–18). Based upon the structure and the context of the psalm, Bernard situates Philip in the role of the Ark as it, and he, moves into the Holy of Holies of the Temple.

Translators of Bernard's letter, such as both James and Bruun, have interpreted the relevant passage of the text where Psalms 121 and 132 join as, "stantes sunt iam *pedes eius* in atriis Ierusalem,' 'et quem audierat in Ephrata, invento in campis silvae libenter adorat in loco ubi steterunt *pedes eius*,'" as: "even now he stands in the courts of Jerusalem' and 'whom he had heard tidings of in Ephrata he has found in the woodland plains, and gladly reverences in the place where he has halted in his journey.'" ⁶⁰ Note that, in their translations, the English version of the Latin sentence treats "*pedes eius*" as Philip's feet both in its first and its second appearance as this would seem most logical upon first glance. This translation is

⁵⁹ "Surge, Domine, in requiem tuam, tu et arca sanctificationis tuae. Sacerdotes tui induantur iustitiam, et sancti tui exsultent" (Psalm 132:8–9).

⁶⁰ [Emphasis mine.] See, for instance, the translation by James, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, 91. See also, Bruun, *Parables*, 103. Bruun discusses the letter in some detail between pages 104 and 106 of her book. She notes, as I do here, that the presence of the psalms within the letter are important governing structures to the text, but our conclusions emerge from somewhat different questions.

understandable within the context of Bernard's letter to Alexander; however, the translator is forced to add an unattached object "[*he*] *whom* he had heard tidings of" for "*quem*" rather than, "[*the elsewhere referred to thing*] *about which* he had heard..." By inserting an unspecified object, the translator abandons the context of the Psalm, which *does* have a direct object, the feminine pronoun *eam*, referring back to the Ark.⁶¹

I suggest that "*quem*" be read with "*loco*" as its referent. It is the "*place* (where his feet are stood) about which Philip heard in Ephrata" and it is in that *place* where Philip "freely worships." Based upon the original context of the psalm, given that the Lord is the subject, the "place where his feet are stood" describes the Mercy Seat of the Temple in Jerusalem; that is, the "footstool of God." My contention, therefore, is that Bernard's biblical exegesis represents the continuation and the culmination of Philip's pilgrim journey such that Philip crosses the seas, then he reaches the "gate of salvation," then he enters the courts of the city, and he stops to worship only upon reaching the innermost place of the Temple within the city.

IB: FROM PILGRIM-WANDERER TO CITIZEN-SAINT

He entered into the holy city; he chose inheritance with those about whom it is rightly said, "*for now you are no longer guests and wayfarers, but fellow citizens among the saints and members of household of God.*" Coming and going with them, just like one of the saints, he boasts—he along with the others—saying: "*our way of life is in heaven.*" He has become not simply an inquisitive observer but an avowed inhabitant and an enrolled citizen of Jerusalem ('although not of this [Jerusalem] on earth, to which mount Sinai of Arabia is joined and which is enslaved along with her sons, but of that [Jerusalem] of the free, which is our mother on high').⁶²

⁶¹ [Emphasis mine.] "Ecce audivimus *eam* in Ephrata; invenimus *eam* in campis silvae" (Psalm 132:6).

⁶² Ingressus est sanctam civitatem, sortitus est cum illis hereditatem, quibus merito dicitur: *iam non estis hospites et advenae, sed estis cives sanctorum et domestici dei* (Eph. 2:15). Cum quibus intrans et exiens, tamquam unus e sanctis, gloriatur et ipse cum ceteris dicens: *conversatio nostra in caelis est* (Phil. 3:20). Factus est ergo non curiosus tantum spectator, sed

Philip left the diocese of Lincoln to visit a city far to the east, and Bernard writes to the bishop to inform him that Philip has chosen to remain in the “holy city,” although perhaps not in city that either Philip or Alexander could have anticipated. In the “holy city,” Philip has ceased to be a “guest” or a “visitor” and has become instead a “fellow citizen among the saints” and a “member of the household of God.”⁶³ Even though Bernard delays to inform the bishop of Philip’s choice to enter the monastery, he hints at this development: “*Nostra conversatio in caelis est*,” as proclaimed by Bernard’s citizen-saints, holds particularly monastic connotations well before the twelfth century. Indeed, the *Rule of Benedict* invokes the language of Philippians both in its portrayal of the monastic enterprise and in its regulations for reception into the monastic community, where novice monks must promise first that they will be stable by remaining within the community, second that they will follow the *conversatio morum*, the monastic “way of life,” and third that they will obey the abbot who takes the place of Christ.⁶⁴

Following the general outline set forth in the *Rule of Benedict*, Philip chooses his inheritance first by becoming a “citizen among the saints” of the city, second by saying with the saints, “our way of life is in heaven”, and third by setting himself as a member of the household

devotus habitator et civis conscriptus Ierusalem, non autem terrenae huius, ‘cui Arabiae mons Sina coniunctus est, quae servit cum filiis suis, sed liberae illius, quae est sursum mater nostra’ (cf. Gal. 4:25–26)”; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 157.

⁶³ Writing about eleventh and twelfth century monastic scholars, Diana Webb observes that “the spiritual man was to be alienated from the world, a *peregrinus*, a stranger in relation to it, but not a vagrant. It was not merely possible, but tempting, to interpret life itself, that ineluctable progress from the cradle to the grave, as a pilgrimage from an earthly to a heavenly birth. The monk had chosen the perfect environment in which to enact this pilgrimage”; Diana Webb, *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c. 700–c. 1500*, European Culture and Society (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 84. Bernard’s interpretation of the monastic “pilgrimage” goes further: the monks of Clairvaux are so removed from the world that they are not even pilgrim wanderers there; his monks have reached their promised land even as they anticipate the fulfillment of eschatological citizenship.

⁶⁴ *Rule of Benedict* 58:17–18 (see note 36 above).

governed by God. As a result of these actions, Philip takes “vows” and is “enrolled” as a citizen of Jerusalem, just as a novice under the *Rule of Benedict* takes vows and has his name enrolled in the registers for the community.⁶⁵ By writing that Philip is an enrolled citizen of Jerusalem, “although not of this [Jerusalem] on earth, to which mount Sinai of Arabia is joined and which is enslaved along with her sons, but of that [Jerusalem] of the free, which is our mother on high” (paraphrasing Galatians 4:25–26), Bernard explicitly dispels any lingering possibility that Philip has made his way east to Jerusalem.

Bernard foreshadowed Philip’s physical and spiritual journey through the two psalms that he quoted early in the letter. In Psalm 121, pilgrims sing the song of praise as they journey to the city whereas it is “saints” (*sancti*) who exult from within the city in Psalm 132. Bernard relies on this term, *sancti*, to describe both the citizens of “Jerusalem” with whom Philip is “entering and exiting” (*intrans et exiens*) and to describe Philip himself who has become “like one of them” (*tamquam unus e sanctis*) once he “takes his vow” and “enrolls his name.” The structure that Bernard employed when moving Philip from pilgrim to saint is logical as a piece of exegesis, but it does not treat the glaring problem of abrogating a prior vow in order to undertake new vows in place of the former one. Thus, Bernard must explain how it would be socially and theologically permissible for a lay pilgrim such as Philip to set aside one set of vows and

⁶⁵ See *Rule of Benedict* 58:19–20, “He makes the petition according to his promise in the name of the saints whose relics are there and of the presiding abbot. He writes this petition in his own hand unless he is illiterate, then another, once asked, writes on his behalf, but the novice adds his mark and he places it by his own hand upon the altar,” (De qua promissione sua faciat petitionem ad nomen sanctorum quorum reliquiae ibi sunt et abbatis praesentis. Quam petitionem manu sua scribat, aut certe, si non scit litteras, alter ab eo rogatus scribat et ille novicius signum faciat et manu sua eam super altare ponat).

obligations (namely his vow to visit Jerusalem “to which mount Sinai of Arabia is joined”) for another set of vows obliging him to citizenship within the “city of monks.”⁶⁶

Bernard has reached the climax of his letter to Alexander. He began Philip’s pilgrim narrative across the sea, took him to the city, brought him into the Temple, and made him a citizen. Enrolled as a citizen of the city that was once the object of Philip’s pilgrimage, Bernard reveals that Philip’s journey took him not to Arabia but to a city on high. Now Bernard dispels all doubt and boldly he proclaims Philip’s “short cut” to the bishop: “Indeed, if you wish to know further, it [i.e., the Jerusalem of the free] is Clairvaux!”

IIA: JERUSALEM IS CLAIRVAUX, CLAIRVAUX IS JERUSALEM

Indeed, if you wish to know further, [Jerusalem] is Clairvaux!

[Clairvaux] herself is Jerusalem, having been united to the one which is in heaven by virtue of unanimous devotion, imitation of [her] way of life, and a particular bond of kinship.

This is his [i.e., Philip’s] journey’s end, as he himself promises, forever. He chose her for his dwelling place because he has found under her roof, if not yet the vision, certainly the expectation, of true peace, of that peace concerning which it is surely said, “*the peace of God, which rises above all understanding*.”⁶⁷

The second part of Bernard’s letter performs two functions: first, Bernard identifies Clairvaux with Jerusalem when he discusses the spiritual state of Philip, who has essentially died to the world and has entered the enduring liminality of the monastic habit; second, Bernard discusses the physical state of Philip’s personal effects, which must be apportioned in Philip’s

⁶⁶ Cf. Athanasius, “The Life and Affairs of Our Holy Father Antony,” 42.

⁶⁷ “Et si vultis scire, Claravallis est. Ipsa est Ierusalem, ei quae in caelis est, tota mentis devotione, et conversationis imitatione, et cognatione quadam spiritus sociata. Haec requies illius, sicut ipse promittit, in saeculum saeculi: elegit eam in habitationem sibi, quod apud eam sit, etsi nondum visio, certe exspectatio verae pacis, illius utique de qua dicitur: *pax dei, quae exsuperat omnem sensum* (Phil. 4:7)”; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 158.

“Last Will and Testament” in order for Philip’s conversion to be effective. Bernard “asks” for the necessary ecclesiastical permissions to release Philip from his communal and religious obligations even as he depicts Philip as one who has already been released from these bonds by virtue of a superseding vow of heavenly citizenship. In the previous chapter, we noted that Cluny linked itself, and was linked in the minds of its donors, to Jerusalem and to Rome by design. Bernard’s method for identifying Clairvaux with Jerusalem is quite different.

According to Bernard, “[Clairvaux] herself is Jerusalem, having been united to the [Jerusalem] which is in heaven by virtue of unanimous devotion, imitation of [her] way of life, and a particular bond of kinship.” Contrary to the established precedent of creating a relationship between city and monastery through physical correlation, Bernard exegetically identifies Clairvaux with the heavenly Jerusalem by grounding the municipal tautology in the members of the monastic community rather than in physical characteristics. The monastic space, Clairvaux, is united to the heavenly Jerusalem by three things. First, it is united by the collective and unanimous devotion of the monks within the community, such that the individual choice of each monk to join into collective action establishes this relationship. Second, it is united by the imitation of her *conversatio*, her “way of life,” such that the monastic brethren, as a singular collective, join the saintly citizens of the heavenly city in singular accord. Third, it is united by “a particular bond of kinship,” such that collective citizenship transforms into shared inheritance, a kinship bond with Christ.

The enduring transformation of Clairvaux into Jerusalem follows the paradigm established in Ephesians, as Bernard describes in this letter with respect to Philip: first, the brethren choose to renounce their earthly ties, settling in “Jerusalem,” ceasing to be wanderers and joining into “unanimous devotion”; next, they take a singular vow of citizenship and they

enter into the *conversatio* of *monachi et Ierosolimitae et sancti* (monks and ‘Jerusalemites’ and saints); finally, in a liminal state between the “heavenly Jerusalem” on earth and the “heavenly Jerusalem” in heaven, they live as co-inheritors of the kingdom of God with the God-man Jesus Christ and his saints, “building themselves up into a holy Temple for the Lord, and a dwelling place of the Spirit of God.”⁶⁸ The members of Clairvaux, Bernard claims in the words of Ephesians 2:19, “are no longer guests and wayfarers, but fellow citizens among the saints and members of God’s household.”

Bernard’s vision of the heavenly Jerusalem expressed in Clairvaux does not rely upon the exegetical power of physical objects or the interpretive force of architecturally correlated space; rather, Bernard’s exegesis of Paul’s epistles relies upon people—the members of his community—as a united brethren to transform the monastery into the city of Jerusalem. This is not to suggest that the physical setting was irrelevant to Bernard’s exegetical project: the monastic cloister demarcated sacred and profane space and the brethren presented a united front because the monastery-turned-city walls bounded them. Locating the interpretive identity within the community still required a municipal site, and Bernard continues his letter to Alexander by stating that Philip has now concluded his journey forever by choosing his dwelling place under a common roof.

Under the roof of Clairvaux, Philip undertook a liminal state which would endure for the remainder of his life along with his monastic brothers. Bernard describes Philip as willfully entering the liminal phase, first by taking a vow and enrolling as a monk/citizen (in section I),

⁶⁸ Cf. Ephesians 2:19–22, “For you are no longer guests or visitors, but you are citizens among the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets with Jesus Christ himself as the principle corner stone, in whom the entire building, having been built together, ascends into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built together into a dwelling place of God in the Spirit.”

then by uniting to Clairvaux/Jerusalem through devotion, imitation of *conversatio*, and kinship. Finally, Philip makes a personal promise to remain “forever.” Philip’s promise to end his journey forever placed him in a state of being that now persists as “not yet the vision, but certainly the expectation of true peace.” True peace, following Ephesians 4:7, is the “peace of God surpassing all understanding”; that is, eschatological peace, the peace of the kingdom of God fully realized at the recreation of heaven and earth. The monastery, “if not yet the vision, then certainly the expectation” of this recreated and renewed world, sits betwixt and between the realized world of brokenness and the anticipated world of restoration.

Betwixt and between, the monks became foreigners to their past just as Turner described the liminal state in rites of passage.⁶⁹ Estranged from his former life, the monk becomes incapable of returning to his prior role in society, and he persists in exile from his former community until the rite concludes. For the monks of Clairvaux, the rite of passage was not one which moved a boy into manhood, although Bernard’s use of spiritual milk and bread in the *Sermons on the Song of Songs* does point to such a metaphorical transition. Rather, the monastic rite of passage transformed man into saint.⁷⁰ The conclusion of this rite lies in the heavenly city of Jerusalem, either in that one in which God and his saints currently dwell in time and up above or in that one which will be at the end of time, descending onto the earth at the moment of

⁶⁹ See Turner, “Liminality and Communitas,” 107, 129. Also, Bynum, “Women’s Stories, Women’s Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner’s Theory of Liminality,” 28, 33.

⁷⁰ Consider Sermon 1.1, in *Sermons on the Song of Songs*: “To you, brothers, I shall say what I should not say to those who are in the world, or at least I shall say it in a different way. The preacher who follows the Apostle Paul’s method of teaching will give them milk to drink, not solid food [cf. 1 Corinthians 3:1–2; Hebrews 5:12–14]. Before those who are spiritually minded more solid food must be set, as the Apostle himself teaches by his own example. ... And so be ready to eat not milk but bread”; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 210; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, 3. For Stock’s interpretation of this passage as it relates to Bernard’s influence on Cistercian thought, see Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, 410–413.

cosmic recreation (cf. Isaiah 60; Revelation 21). Bernard did not invent a monastic liminal phase; the idea of liminal separation was central both to eremitic and to coenobitic expressions of monasticism. Bernard's interpretation of the community, however, drew upon the image set forth in the *Rule of Benedict* for a communal place of learning in the "tent of God" and augmented that depiction with a conceptualization of Jerusalem and Jerusalemites drawn from centuries of exegetical thought most recently expressed by monastic movements such as Cluny and by the rhetoric of the crusades. Bernard's exegetical approach for constructing "Jerusalem" relies upon a hermeneutics of reading tradition and the changing theological and political landscape of twelfth-century reforms alongside the vast implications of crusade in order to respond to the needs of his community at a particular moment in western European history.⁷¹

IIB: LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

This, his true good, although he receives it from above, still he wants to have your approval; indeed, he trusts that you have already given it, knowing that you are not ignorant of the teachings of Proverbs of Solomon [lit. the words of the Wise One], namely that the 'wise son is the glory of the father.'⁷² Yet he asks Your Paternity, rather we ask—indeed we with him and on his behalf—that you should honor [lit. you should make stand unmoving] whatever he set aside from his prebend for his creditors, lest, since he is gone, he should be found in any matter a defrauder of debts or a transgressor of pact, and so, as a result, the service of a contrite heart, which each brother offers daily, might not be accepted while he has someone against him.

Furthermore, he beseechs [Your Paternity] that the house which he built on church land for his mother, along with the land which he assigned there, be given

⁷¹ As Stock observes, "there was no generalized medieval 'hermeneutics.' Rather there were different, individualistic methodologies adapted to different cultural, psychological, and social needs"; Stock, *Listening for the Text*, 39.

⁷² Cf. Proverbs 10:1, "The wise son gladdens his father, but the foolish son is the sadness of his mother;" "Filius sapiens laetificat patrem, filius vero stultus moestitia est matris suae."

over to his mother for as long as she may live. These things [we ask] on behalf of Philip.⁷³

Bernard concludes the second section of his letter, which deals with Philip's spiritual and physical state, by providing Alexander with the novice's "Last Will and Testament." Philip began his travel to Jerusalem between major crusading campaigns, so perhaps a lessened sense of immediate threat had caused him to forgo any discussion for the disposal of his property in the event of his untimely death. Perhaps, but considerable evidence indicates that any sort of pilgrimage to Jerusalem significantly imperiled the pilgrim during this period. Urban II's initial concession of salvific indulgence required that the crusaders incur grave danger in order that they might become like "living sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God."⁷⁴ Furthermore, the imminent peril was both known and accepted by the pilgrims and their ecclesiastical counselors as an

⁷³ "Verum hoc suum bonum, etsi desuper accepit, in vestro tamen beneplacito facere cupit, immo se fecisse confidit, sciens vos Sapientis non ignorare sententiam, quod 'filius utique sapiens sit gloria patris' (cf. Prov. 10:1). Rogat autem paternitatem vestram, rogamus et nos cum illo et pro illo, quatenus de praebenda sua quod ipse suis creditoribus constituit, immobiliter stare faciat, ne in aliquo fraudator, quod absit, debiti, et praevaricator pacti inveniatur, et ita munus contriti cordis, quod offert quotidie, non recipiatur, dum frater quispiam habet aliquid adversus eum. Precatur deinde, ut domus quam ipse matri suae in terra ecclesiae construxit, cum terra quam ibi delegavit, eidem matri, quamdiu vixerit, concedatur Haec pro Philippo"; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 158.

⁷⁴ Robert of Rheims, "quoting" Urban II, writes: "Whoever, therefore, shall determine upon this holy pilgrimage and shall make his vow to God to that effect and shall offer himself to Him as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, shall wear the sign of the cross of the Lord on his forehead or on his breast..."; Robert of Rheims, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, in Peters, *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, 29. What exactly Urban II offered the crusaders remains somewhat unclear. Robert of Rheims and Fulcher of Chartres characterize Urban's concession as the 'remission of sins' although Diana Webb indicates that Fulcher's "Urban" required the crusader to die on the journey, either in battle or in captivity, for the remission to be in effect. She writes that "William of Malmesbury's version was that the journey, properly motivated, should serve instead of 'all penance'"; see, Webb, *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c. 700–c. 1500*, 21. Penny Cole has discussed the challenge of reconstructing Urban II's sermon at Clermont in Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 1–36.

important functional element of the penitential journey.⁷⁵ If it would have been likely for Philip to anticipate the possibility of death, such that he would likely have ordered his affairs prior to his departure, why then would Bernard take the time to write a will? I suggest that Bernard provides Alexander with Philip's "Last Will and Testament" because the letter functions as a semi-legal document as well as as a kind of obituary. Philip has undertaken a specific vow—to endure pilgrimage to Jerusalem—and Bernard is writing to inform Alexander both that Philip has, for all intents and purposes, fulfilled his initial vow and that Philip has undertaken another vow that supersedes the first in its severity and in its effectiveness.

Bernard's letter to Alexander was not the first occasion in which the abbot had written to a secular authority regarding the undertaking of vows. In a letter written around 1128 to Geoffrey, Bishop of Chartres (Letter 55), Bernard asked the bishop to assist a holy recluse who had recently broken his vow by leaving his cell. Bernard hopes that Geoffrey might provide the wayward recluse with a new little cell in order to return him to his "former pasture."⁷⁶ In a subsequent letter to Geoffrey (Letter 57), Bernard returns to the plight of the poor recluse since he has word that Geoffrey had been less than forthcoming with offering help. Bernard explains that the recluse originally left his cell in order to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem but that he now intends to break that vow in preference to the original vow of solitude, and Bernard argues that

⁷⁵ Travel to and from the Holy Land was made more secure by the Hospitalers (Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem) and by the Knights Templar (Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon) which were established in 1099 and 1119 respectively. Nevertheless, as Webb points out, "the rigours of travel in medieval conditions inevitably imparted a penitential element to pilgrimage, which could be aggravated by additional requirements imposed either on oneself or by superior authority: these might include going barefoot, in scanty clothing or in fetters, and abstaining from certain foods"; Webb, *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c.700–c.1500*, 23, 51; here 51.

⁷⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 147. Letter 58 in James' edition; see, Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, 85.

“less important vows ought not to hinder more important ones,” (*ego non arbitror minora vota impedire debere maiora*). Bernard assures the bishop that he is acting rightly and that the recluse’s parochial bishop will be thankful to him for his service.⁷⁷ The contrast between Bernard’s exchange with Geoffrey on behalf of the unnamed recluse and this letter to Alexander regarding Philip is instructive.

Bernard’s argument concerning Philip is essentially and functionally different from the one that he made to Geoffrey concerning the recluse even though both letters appear to consider the breaking of pilgrimage vows. In the case of the unnamed recluse, Bernard argued that the recluse has made two mistakes—first when leaving his cell and second when vowing pilgrimage to Jerusalem—because his initial vow of solitude represented the greater spiritual good. Thus, Bernard judges that it is more fitting that the recluse break the lesser, later vow in order to return to the greater, earlier vow, as this scenario would be more beneficial to the state of his soul. In the case of Philip, Bernard absolutely reiterates that remaining in the “heavenly Jerusalem” of Clairvaux represents the greater, indeed the greatest, vow that Philip might undertake. He does not, however, concurrently argue that Philip intends to break his original vow of pilgrimage. Bernard’s letter to Alexander claims, rather, that Philip has *fulfilled* the first (lesser) vow of pilgrimage by coming to Clairvaux and that now Philip prepares to undertake a second (greater) vow of stability by remaining within the monastic cloister. Philip, in Bernard’s estimation, has done nothing representative of breaking a religious vow such that further justification of the greater in the face of the lesser is required to support Philip’s actions of setting aside the one vow for the other. For Bernard’s interpretation to hold true, the exegetical identity between Clairvaux

⁷⁷ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 149. Letter 60 in James’ edition; see, Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, 86.

and Jerusalem must be robust enough to fulfill the letter and the spirit of a vow sworn before God and man. In other words, by traveling to Clairvaux, Philip has acted in accordance with both divine and human law, at least in Bernard's estimation.

A vow is both a legal and a religious action; it is binding both on earth and in heaven, so Bernard must explain his novice's actions in such a way that he convinces both earthly ecclesiastical authorities and the ultimate authority of the heavenly courts that Philip's actions are acceptable and that they cause no detriment to Philip's soul.⁷⁸ Thus, Bernard writes to Alexander to inform him of a divine mandate even as he asks for permission, which he expects already to have received. In this sense Bernard can write, "this, his true good, although he receives it from above, still he wants to have your approval; indeed, he trusts that you have already given it, knowing that you are not ignorant of the teachings of Proverbs of Solomon, namely that the 'wise son is the glory of the father.'" Citing Proverbs, and depicting Alexander as the beneficiary to Philip's more perfect choice to depart this life for monastic liminality, Bernard continues the letter in the form of a legal document by redefining the social parameters of the vow for Philip's prior social engagements. Here again, though, the entreaty to Alexander is not one of contingency—that is, "do this *if* Philip does not return"—but rather one of completion—that is, "do as Philip has directed *because* he is dead to the world and may never return."

⁷⁸ Diana Webb writes: "A vow transformed a voluntary undertaking into an obligatory one. ... Vows resembled oaths and possessed a solemn binding force from which absolution would have to be sought if the thing vowed proved to be impossible, insuperably difficult or simply, in the cold light of day, less of a good idea than it had seemed at the time. ... Failure to keep vows of pilgrimage to Rome, Jerusalem or Compostela meant application to the pope himself for dispensation or commutation..."; *Ibid.*, 57.

Bernard asks for two things. Taking the latter issue first, Bernard asks that Philip's mother be cared for during the period of her natural life in order that Philip's choice to enroll as a citizen among the saints does not, one must assume, contravene the commandment to honor one's father and mother.⁷⁹ Bernard initially requests that Alexander utilize Philip's prebend (a clerical benefice providing a stipend for the recipient from a church estate) to fulfill any outstanding debts that Philip has accrued. Bernard's legal reasoning is two-fold: first, debts and pacts bind parties together with bonds of obligation. The monastic vow is a supersessionary vow that, on account of its permanent liminality, overwhelms all other obligations. The vow is supererogatory and surpassingly good. It would contravene the spirit of such a vow for its undertaking to defraud those to whom Philip was bound by prior obligations. Therefore, Bernard asks Alexander to fulfill, and thus to complete, all prior vows. Second, Bernard suggests that, no matter how surpassing in goodness the monastic vow may be, Philip would be unable to undertake the vow truly if he has not ended his prior engagements satisfactorily.

Vows as Elements of Ritual Liminality

The transformative act of undertaking communal vows represented a central aspect of Benedictine monasticism that was only heightened by the reform-minded Cistercian Order. The *Rule of Benedict* requires three vows—stability within the same community; living the common way of life with the brethren (*conversatio morum*), and obedience to the monastic hierarchy—but these vows do not always stand in mutual accord among themselves or among the brethren. For example, the *Exordium Cistercii*, after briefly introducing Molesme as a wealthy yet virtuous

⁷⁹ “Honor your father and your mother so that you may be long-lived upon the land which the LORD your God shall give to you” (*honora patrem tuum et matrem tuam ut sis longevus super terram quam Dominus Deus tuus dabit tibi*) (Exodus 20:12, cf. Deuteronomy 5:16 and Ephesians 6:1–2).

monastery in Langres, described the choice of Robert and his monks to depart in the following manner:

Still, because association of possessions with virtues is not usually long-lasting, certain men from that holy congregation—men undoubtedly wise and of deeper understanding—chose rather to be occupied with heavenly pursuits than to be entangled in earthly affairs. So it was that the lovers of the virtues soon enough began thinking upon poverty, fruitful mother of a virile stock, at the same time perceiving that, though one could live there in a holy and respectable manner, this still fell short of their desire and purpose to observe the Rule they had professed. They speak to one another about what is moving each of them, and likewise discuss together how they may fulfill that verse, *I will pay you my vows, which my lips have uttered*, (Psalm 65:13).⁸⁰

The author of the *Exordium* concedes the virtuosity of Molesme even as he denies it by characterizing the parent monastery as “earthly” in its wealth and potentially falling short in its pursuit of heavenly goals by offering greater opportunities for monks to stray. As a result of this, the founders of the Cistercian Order broke their vow of stability by leaving the monastery, broke their bonds with the *conversatio* of their community by rejecting its tainted spirituality, and broke, if not the letter than surely the spirit of, their vow of obedience to the abbot inasmuch as Robert, the abbot, absconded with the departing monks.

The founders of Cîteaux broke their vows in order to create a community that more perfectly represented the ideals of the *Rule of Benedict*. This action presents a bit of a paradox—it is an deed at odds with its own purpose—and this is how the Cistercians describe the

⁸⁰ Waddell, *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: Latin Text in Dual Edition with English Translation and Notes*, 400. Waddell gives the probable author of the tripartite text (*Exordium Cistercii*, *Summa Cartae caritatis*, and the *Capitula*) as Raynard de Bar, abbot of Cîteaux from 1134/1135–1150 with an approximate date *ca.* 1136/1137. It is interesting to note that the quoted psalm is a song in praise to God for deliverance during the period of the Exodus. These verses, more fully quoted, are “I shall come to your Temple with burnt offerings, and pay my vows to you—vows that my lips promised and my mouth spoke while I was in trouble.” Whether or not Robert and his fellow reformers discussed this psalm during their “exodus,” the context of the song was clearly relevant to the author of the *Exordium*.

foundation of their Order. Notably, young Philip acts in much the same way: he chooses to break his vow of pilgrimage (however much Bernard may claim that he has fulfilled it) in order to undertake a new, stricter, and more spiritually edifying set of vows at Clairvaux. Furthermore, just as the *Exordium Cistercii* defended and warranted the actions of the early founders of Cîteaux by contrasting earthy and heavenly analogues, so too does Bernard's construction of Clairvaux as a superior "heavenly Jerusalem" in contrast to the "earthly Jerusalem" of the Holy Land serve to abrogate and to justify Philip's actions, which should be binding both on earth and in heaven.

To consider the words of the *Exordium Cistercii* or Bernard's words in Letter 64 as mere sophistry, as words which attempted to justify a legally and theologically unjustifiable position, would fail to understand the merits of their expressions. Although there were a number of influential contemporary critics writing against both the Cistercians as a group and Bernard as an individual, their criticisms do not raise issue with the breaking of vows. As such, it would seem that the action of breaking lesser vows in order to undertake more demanding ones was not a major issue. In fact, there exists greater evidence to suggest that, during the period of reforms, the idea of undertaking more severe obligations, which were accompanied with more definite personal challenges, was both acceptable and popular: the rise of reform-minded monastic houses was as apparent to contemporary medieval observers as it is to modern historians.⁸¹ The popular acceptance of increasing degrees of avowed severity represented the common approval

⁸¹ Reminiscent to Athanasius' observation that Antony's desert became a "city of monks" during the late antique period of rising eremitism, Orderic Vitalis (1075–1142) noted a rise of contemporary coenobitism when he wrote: "Though evil abounds in the world the devotion of the faithful in cloisters grows more abundant and bears fruit a hundredfold in the Lord's field. Monasteries are founded everywhere in mountain valleys and plains, observing new rites and wearing different habits; the swarm of cowled monks spreads all over the world"; see Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 33.

for increasing numbers of individuals within the Christian West to remove themselves from the world in order to enter into varying states of liminality, whether it be the temporary liminality of pilgrimage or the enduring liminality of the cloister.

The three monastic vows of liminality, the vows which initiate the ritual rite of passage from human to saint, demand the breaking of former societal ties: entering into the sacred space of the monastery, “[the monk] is a new creature, the old has passed away, for all things are made new.”⁸² This process of transformation, according to Bernard’s theology, can neither be initiated nor completed so long as there remains unfinished worldly business for the novice. One cannot be both saint and sinner; the sinner must die in the world in order to enter the purgation of the monastery before he may truly identify with the holy citizenry.⁸³

III: THE ABBOT ADVISES THE BISHOP

We thought that the remaining few words, which have been presumed in love (*in caritate*), should be added for you in order to encourage you by this one recounting them, indeed by the true God inspiring them, lest you should regard the glory of the world, which will fall away, as standing firm so that you lose sight of what truly stands; lest you esteem your things more for your yourself or for your household so that you should lose yourself and yours; lest one’s own prosperity, presently flattering, should hide the end from you so that adversity without end should follow; lest temporary happiness should hide from you the eternal suffering which it bears and should bring forth that which it conceals; lest death should be thought to be far off and it should seize upon you unprepared, and life, while expected to last a long time, should unkindly leave you guilty, just as it was written: “*when they shall say: “peace and security”, then sudden destruction*

⁸² Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:17, “Si qua ergo in Christo nova creatura, vetera transierunt: ecce facta sunt omnia nova.”

⁸³ Philip’s obligations to his creditors represented only one set of relational obligations that could affect the “service of the contrite heart.” Even within the cloister, Cistercian ideas and ideals of love focused upon the belief that brotherly love remained essential to properly conducted love for the divine. Thus, as Philip could not enter the liminal state fully without resolution of his prior earthly ties, his enduring success within the liminal community depended upon bonds of love (rather than bonds of debt) in order to establish his citizenship among the saints. For more on the study of Cistercian brotherly love, see Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 42.

*will overtake them, just like the [pain] of a pregnant woman, and they shall not escape.” Fare well.*⁸⁴

Bernard concludes his letter to the bishop of Lincoln by relating the themes established in his discussion of Philip and Clairvaux to Alexander’s own life. Bernard challenges Alexander to favor poverty and austerity above all, to set aside earthly “goods” in favor of the true goods of heaven. By directing his “love” (*caritas*) towards the bishop, Bernard reaffirms Philip’s superior choice to become a monk, and he reinforces the surpassing existence of Clairvaux as the “heavenly Jerusalem” by championing the values of the monastery in contrast to Alexander’s lived reality. Philip, unlike Alexander, has departed from this world for heavenly citizenship; he has departed from his familial household for a “particular bond of kinship” in the household of God; he has departed from his goods for the shared property of *communitas*; he has departed from temporal happiness for eternal praise with the saints; and he has departed from life to endure in the liminal state awaiting eternity. Like the proverbial son who brings glory to his father, Philip’s actions serve both as a product of Alexander’s teachings and as an exemplar for Alexander to follow in pursuit of supernal joy.

CONCLUSION: THE LETTER TO ALEXANDER AS SECULAR-RELIGIOUS DISCOURSE

Bernard’s letter reflects the manner in which the monastic thought-world of Clairvaux could be expressed to someone outside of the cloister. Philip came to Clairvaux ostensibly

⁸⁴ “Reliqua haec pauca pro vobis, ipso quidem intimante, immo vero inspirante Deo, adicienda putavimus, hortari vos in caritate praesumentes, ne casuri gloriam mundi quasi stantem aspiciatis, et vere stantem amittatis; ne plus vobis aut pro vobis vestra diligatis, et sic vos et vestra perdatis; ne blandiens praesens prosperitas sui vobis finem abscondat, et adversitas sine fine succedat; ne laetitia temporalis luctum vobis aeternum et operiat quem parit, et pariat quem operit; ne mors longe esse putetur et praeoccupet improvidum, et vita, dum longa exspectatur, cito deserat male consciunt, sicut scriptum est: *cum dixerint: pax et securitas, tunc subitaneus superveniet interitus, tamquam in utero habenti, et non effugient* (1 Thes. 5:3). Valete”; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 158.

during the course of pilgrimage, so Bernard captured the language of pilgrimage and pilgrim vows during the era of crusade, and he translated that language into a description of the soul's journey into its final, spiritual repose. Writing about a lay pilgrim, he told the story of a man leaving behind his humanity in order to join in fellowship and in citizenship among the saints within the household of God. Thus, Bernard wrote to his secular audience by utilizing an exegetical interpretation of the Bible in order to transform sacred-secular events—the vow and the pilgrimage, which held specific ramifications in the sociopolitical and in the ecclesiastical-theological spheres—into a wholly spiritualized journey into monastic *communitas*. In other words, Bernard's act of exegesis transformed the categories of discourse in ways analogous to Philip's own personal transformation.

“OPEN FOR ME THE GATES OF THE RIGHTEOUS”: BERNARD PREACHES ASCENSION

When Bernard described Philip's pilgrimage into the heavenly Jerusalem that is Clairvaux, the language and the structure that he employed relied upon theological paradigms of ascent into God. Ascent, the act of climbing or going up, was embedded within the biblical notion of pilgrimage to Jerusalem for its earliest imagination. The *cantica graduum* are “songs of the ascents” precisely because these were the songs sung by those pilgrims “ascending” to Jerusalem in order to worship at the Temple of the Lord. Bernard used these songs both as exegetical and as geographical markers in his account of Philip's travel. Philip departed over a chaotic sea, reached land and hurried up to the “gate of salvation.” Once inside the holy city, he followed the path of the Ark of the Covenant as it was brought up through the city streets, up through the Temple courts, and ultimately installed at the pinnacle of the holy mountain, the Holy of Holies where God's presence irrupts into the world of creation between the wings of the

cherubim. Likewise Philip rose up to worship God at his very footstool, for he himself sought to ascend the holy mountain in order to praise his creator at the very epicenter of sacred power.

The story that Bernard told to Alexander remains a story told to an outsider. Even as a bishop, Alexander cannot be privy to the *sacra* of monastic teaching; the outsider remains unaware of the holy mysteries taught inside the liminal cloister. In order to learn something of the aftermath of Philip's fateful journey and in order to find out what it was like to be so proximate to God's sacred might, we must turn to Bernard's sermons, particularly his sermons preached on the Feast of the Ascension of the Lord (celebrated on the fortieth day of Easter, following Acts 1:3), which provide a glimpse into the theological and exegetical world existing inside the sacred municipal walls of the Cistercian "textual community.

THE FEAST OF THE ASCENSION AT CLAIRVAUX: LITURGICAL SERMON AND LITURGICAL PRACTICE

The sermon proved to be the most effective means to convey ideas of theology within the cloister since the genre functioned both as an oral community-building experience and as a written conveyor of theological education as the text of *lectio divina*. That being said, Bernard preached and wrote many sermons, not all of which aid our understanding of his construction of the monastery as a sacred space by virtue of its identification with the "heavenly Jerusalem." One of his abbatial decrees and the sermons that he preached on the Feast of the Ascension, however, do offer valuable insight into the mind of the preacher and into the inner understanding of his monastic community with respect to the idea of the monastery as a site for a distinctly Cistercian practice of ascent into God.

Rather late in the abbot's life, Bernard instituted an Ascension procession for the monks of Clairvaux.⁸⁵ Helinand of Froidmont (1150–1237), who features more prominently in the next chapter, included this entry in his *Chronicon* (a chronicle of world history) for the year 1151:

Saint Bernard established a third procession in our Order, that of the Ascension. For heretofore only two [processions] were established, namely that of the Purification and that of Palm Sunday. But that holy man (*vir sanctus*) thought it appropriate that we should escort Christ, he returning from earth to heaven, just like the angels had escorted him coming from heaven unto us; and in the book of the Roman Order, that day was given the name “the watch for the Holy Jerusalem” (*statio ad sanctam Ierusalem*).⁸⁶

Helinand, as Jean Leclercq has argued and as Beverly Kienzle reports, “based his *Chronicon* entry on information given by Geoffrey of Auxerre in a report of [Bernard's] sermon and in two passages Leclercq identified in Troyes Ms. 503.”⁸⁷ Thus, Helinand's *Chronicon* provides a thirteenth-century snapshot of a mid-twelfth century event that continues to confirm and to reaffirm the ongoing discussion that the Cistercian Order, especially Bernard's conception of it, focused on the monastery as a heavenly Jerusalem made sacred by the community of monk-saints. Helinand writes that Bernard's procession united and sanctified mundane time in two ways. On the one hand, time is sanctified by recourse to biblical history: the monks re-enact the Ascension by serving as analogues to the angels accompanying Christ on his salvific mission. On the other hand, time is sanctified by eschatological anticipation: the monks are transfigured alongside their Lord as they boldly depart their “Jerusalem” in order to follow and to escort

⁸⁵ This procession was adopted in the second redaction of the Cistercian *Usages*; see, Jean Leclercq, “Une ancienne rédaction des coutumes cisterciennes,” *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 47 (1952): 174.

⁸⁶ “Sanctus Bernardus tertiam processionem ascensionis Dominicae in ordine nostro constituit. Nam antea nonnisi duae precedentes, Purificationis scilicet et Dominicae in Ramis Palmarum, fiebant. Sed dignum duxit esse vir ille sanctus, ut Christum redeuntem de terris ad caelos prosequeremur, sicut angeli illum fuerant prosecuti, venientem de caelis ad nos; et in libro Ordinis Romani ea die intitulatur statio ad sanctam Ierusalem”; *Chronicon*, PL 212, col. 1057D.

⁸⁷ Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 314.

Christ from earth to heaven (*de terris ad caelos*), installing him in his heavenly abode where all hold common citizenship.⁸⁸

THE JOURNEY TO GOD'S RIGHT HAND: ASCENSION AS PRECURSOR TO THE CISTERCIAN ORDER

Jean Leclercq introduces Bernard's Ascension sermons by writing that that, "for Bernard the Ascension was the accomplishment of the mystery of love by which the Incarnate Word, until then hidden in the lowliness of the flesh, and finally ascended to the glory of the Father, could send to humans the Spirit which would unite them to the Father in love."⁸⁹ Following Helinand's description, the dual event of the Incarnation and the Ascension established a divine and sacred bridge that both permitted God's spirit to dwell among humankind and allowed human beings to dwell among the household of God.

Five major sermons, three short sermons, and part of one of the *Sermons on the Song of Songs* offer textual insight into Bernard's preaching on the Ascension as an essential component of Christian theophany. Bernard's First Sermon on the Ascension affirms the "humanity of the Savior," provides moral teaching, and leaves "little question of the mystery of Christ."⁹⁰ It is Bernard's Second Sermon, however, which may prove more interesting here. In this sermon Bernard recounts the "itinerary of the Son of God."⁹¹

⁸⁸ In Bernard's Fourth Sermon on the Ascension, especially 4.9, Bernard describes a kind of mental procession for his audience through the various courts of the Temple of God located within the heavenly Jerusalem. This important section will be discussed in the next chapter alongside Helinand's treatment of Bernardine Ascension themes.

⁸⁹ Jean Leclercq, "The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard," trans. Sister Elizabeth Connor, O.C.S.O., *Cistercian Studies* 25, no. 1 (1990): 11.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ It should not be assumed that Bernard's other sermons are irrelevant to the line of argumentation developed above; however, Bernard's Second Sermon on the Ascension represents his most complete exploration of the present topic. Where noteworthy, I will include elements of the other sermons for comparison, but I will use the Second Sermon as an instructive, rather than an exhaustive, example.

Bernard begins his Second Sermon on the Ascension with a quotation from Ephesians 4, a portion of the biblical lection for this feast day. He explains that the Feast of the Ascension is the “consummation and the fulfillment of the remaining solemnities, and the happy conclusion to the entire journey of the Son of God. For *He who descended is the very one who ascended on this very day over all the heavens, in order that He might fill all things.*”⁹² Two things merit immediate note. First, Bernard argues that Christ’s Ascension is the consummation (*consummatio*), the fulfillment (*adimpletio*), and the end (*clausula*) of his salvific journey, which corresponds to Bernard’s depiction above of Clairvaux (“Jerusalem”) as the place of eternal rest for its monastic inhabitants on their journey of salvation. Second, the insertion of *hodierna die* (“on this very day”) unites Bernard’s monastic audience to the experience of the Apostles, who benefitted from Christ’s presence between Easter and the Ascension, and so Bernard draws all into the narrative of New Testament history at the point in time that anticipates most strongly Christ’s imminent and glorious return. Thus, Bernard juxtaposes the monastic life to the life of Christ and he compresses past, present, and future salvation history into a single transformative event that sanctifies both time and space (*adimpleret omnia*).⁹³

⁹² “Consummatio enim et adimpletio est reliquarum sollempnitatum, et felix clausula totius itinerarii Filii Dei. Qui enim *descendit, ipse est et qui ascendit hodierna die super omnes caelos, ut adimpleret omnia,*” (Eph. 4:10); presented in Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 317; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 5 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1968), 126. For additional discussion of this sermon, see Leclercq, “The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard,” 11.

⁹³ As Bernard continues, he describes the ways in which Christ’s life, death, resurrection and ascension manifested his power over all things on earth, in the seas, in hell, and, ultimately, in heaven. As a conclusion to his *itinerarium*, the Ascension of the Lord fills all time and all space with his power and dominion, as he is Lord of All (*Dominus universorum*); see, Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 317; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 126.

Bernard describes Jesus as “our treasure in heaven,” following Colossians 2:2–3, and Leclercq adds in his discussion of these sermons, “but He is genuinely a treasure only because the fullness of the divinity continues to inhabit Him corporally, as was the case while He was on earth.”⁹⁴ Sacrificing himself on behalf of the whole Christian body of believers, Christ is the treasure who redeems sinful humanity from the Fall. Unlike Satan and the first humans, who sought to elevate themselves out of false and unwarranted pride, Christ chose to humble himself in order to be raised up to the “right hand of the Father.”⁹⁵ The humility of Christ both permits and ensures the salvation and the elevation of all of humankind through him, for Christ is the head and the Church is his body. Bernard observes:

Christ, by the nature of his divinity, had no way of growing greater or rising higher, since nothing is above God; yet by descending on earth, he nevertheless invented a way of growing greater: he came to become incarnate, to suffer, to die, that we might not die eternally. Because of that, God exalted him: he is risen, he ascended, he is seated at the right hand of God.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Leclercq, “The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard,” 12. Cf. Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Ascensione, Sermo secundus* in Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 318f.

⁹⁵ Bernard discusses the apparent paradox of Ephesians 4:10, that “in [Christ’s] very descending that he ascended,” both in his Second Sermon on the Ascension and in his Fourth. For further discussion, consider Leclercq, “The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard,” 12–13.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 12. Bernard returns to this position in his Fourth Sermon on the Ascension. There he begins by wondering what the Feast of the Ascension has to do with him, since his way of life (*conversatio*) is terrestrial. He reasons that Christ, who was of heaven, made himself relevant to human beings by descending before he ascended. Humans, he reasons, can never ascend unless they first descend in humility by following the example of their Lord. He asks: “Really and truly, what is this solemnity to me, if my way of life (*conversatio*) up to now is held on the ground. Truly, who may dare to desire ascent into heaven, if not for him, who first descended, ascending? (Verumtamen quid mihi et sollemnitatibus istis, si conversatio mea usque adhuc detinetur in terris? Quis vero vel desiderare praesumeret ascensum caeli, nisi quia is qui descenderat prior ascendit?); Sermon 4.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 137.

To the monks of his monastery—that is, to those who have been made participators in the Ascension of the Lord by virtue of the ritual procession conducted within their own “heavenly Jerusalem”—Bernard exclaims:

Speaking words of benediction over [the Apostles], [Jesus Christ] was carried into heaven, shaken perhaps in that singular heart of compassion, since he was leaving behind his poor wretches (*miseros*) and his poor school (*pauperem suam scholam*), except that he was coming to prepare a place for them, and because he was hurrying so that he might take away the present body from them.⁹⁷ How happy, how worthy is this procession, according to which the Apostles themselves were not yet worthy to join in when, having been led to the Father by the triumphal parade of saintly souls and celestial powers, he sits at the right hand of God!⁹⁸

Bernard’s presentation of Christ’s procession to the right hand of God is primarily biblical: Christ leaves behind his faithful Apostles in order to make way for the Holy Spirit while he prepares a better place for them. Bernard, however, refigures the scriptural narrative slightly to relate the biblical story to his contemporary monastic audience. Departing from a strict quotation of the New Testament, Bernard describes the Apostles as “poor wretches” (*miseros*) and as “his poor (that is, ‘impoverished’) school” (*pauperem suam scholam*). Both of these terms held particular resonance among the “apostolically-minded” Cistercians in their quest for

⁹⁷ Bernard returns to the biblically-based idea that Christ needed to ascend into heaven in order that the Holy Spirit descend upon the Apostles in his Third Sermon on the Ascension; see especially Sermon 3.8, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 136. For additional details on the contents of this sermon, see Leclercq, “The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard,” 12–13.

⁹⁸ “Benedicens ergo eis ferebatur in caelum (cf. Luke 24:50–51), forte concussis illius singularis misericordiae visceribus (cf. Col. 3:12), cum miseros suos et pauperem suam scholam relinqueret, nisi quod veniebat parare eis locum (cf. John 14:2), et quia expediebat ut praesentiam eis subtraheret corporalem (cf. John 16:7). Quam felix, quam digna ista processio, ad quam ne ipsi adhuc Apostoli digni fuerunt admitti, cum, et animarum sanctarum, et caelestium virtutum triumphali pompa deductus ad Patrem, *sedet a dextris Dei!* (Mark 16:19); Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 319; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 128. For Kienzle’s translation of these sermons, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 29–68, here 34.

austerity and poverty. Yet, unlike the Apostles, who must wait to join the saintly procession, Bernard states that the community of Clairvaux *does* process, as part of their liturgical cycle, alongside Christ as he makes his way to God’s right hand. This is the procession that Helinand described above as one undertaken by the monks to “escort Christ, he returning from earth to heaven, just like the angels had escorted him, coming from heaven unto us.”⁹⁹

I do not argue that Bernard viewed the Cistercian community as more worthy or more holy than the Apostles; rather, I think that Bernard intended to convey to his congregation that the procession that the Apostles are “not yet” (*adhuc*) permitted to attend in history is the same procession that the Cistercian community *does* attend liturgically as a “vision and an expectation” of the future procession that all of the saints—Apostles, Cistercians, etc.—*will* attend on the Day of Judgment. Jesus goes to prepare a place for his saints in heaven, and that place is the place of repose coming at the end of time, but Clairvaux, inasmuch as it is a vision of the heavenly city, represents the closest thing to a place prepared by Christ for his *scola* prior to the culmination of Christian salvation history.

WHAT IS THIS PARACLETE?: ASCENSION AS PRECURSOR TO THE CISTERCIAN ORDER

In his Fourth Sermon on the Ascension, Bernard explains the importance and the necessity of Christ’s departure for the salvation of the Apostles and, more directly, for the salvation of the Cistercian community. Wondering about Christ’s departure, which Bernard describes as necessary for the advent of the Holy Spirit, Bernard rhetorically asks his audience, “what is this Paraclete?” He responds:

Certainly it is the one through whom love (*caritas*) pours forth, and now hope does not confound. That Paraclete, ‘*through whom it is that our way of life may*

⁹⁹ “ut Christum redeuntem de terris ad caelos prosequeremur, sicut angeli illum fuerant persecuti, venientem de caelis ad nos”; *Chronicon*, PL 212, col. 1057D.

be in heaven’; the ‘Power from above’ through whom our hearts may be raised up. “I go,” he said, “to prepare a place for you; and if I shall go, then I shall come again, and I shall take you up with me.” ‘For where the corpse will be, there eagles congregate.’ Surely you see in what way this feast, among the other solemnities, this one which we celebrate today, may be considered the consummation (*consummationem*) [of the others], and may be called “the reward” (*fructum*), and may increase grace?¹⁰⁰

The sending forth of the Holy Spirit represents for Bernard both the possibility and the vehicle by which the Cistercian Order may undertake to ascend, like Christ, into God. The Paraclete, the bringer of *caritas*—the exegetical virtue-paradigm so central to the Cistercian textual community—permits the realization of the heavenly way of life that the monks pursue upon entering the walls of the cloistral Jerusalem by its presence in their midst. By celebrating the Feast of the Ascension, by observing Christ as he ascends and by inviting the Paraclete to descend and to dwell among them, Bernard brings sanctified time to bear on constructing a sacred space for his brethren.

The fourth section of Bernard’s Second Sermon on the Ascension shifts to the first person singular as Bernard relates both his anxieties and his hopes concerning the salvation offered by Christ. Bernard’s construction of the monastery and his monastic community as a sacred space and a sacred people, straddling the boundaries between heaven and earth, continues to undergird his thoughts. Bernard wonders how he might properly share in the solemnity of the Ascension

¹⁰⁰ [Emphasis mine.] “Quis Paraclitus? Utique per quem diffunditur caritas, et iam spes non confundit: ille Paraclitus, per quem in caelis sit conversatio nostra; virtus ex alto, per quam sursum sint corda nostra. *Vado, inquit, vobis parare locum; et si abiero, iterum veniam, et assumam vos a meipsum*, (John 14:2–3). *Ubi enim fuerit corpus, ibi congregabuntur et aquilae*, (Luke 17:37). Vides ne quemadmodum ceterarum sollempnitatum ea, quam hodie celebramus, et consummationem habeat, et fructum declaret, et augeat gratiam?”; Sermon 4.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 137. For Kienzle’s translation, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 44.

since he bore witness neither to the crucifixion, nor to the blood-red wounds, nor to the pale of death.¹⁰¹ Yet he finds consolation from the angels who promise to him as much as to the Apostles, “Men of Galilee, why are you standing and staring at the sky? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into heaven, shall thus come again, in the same form you shall see him as he was going into heaven,” (Acts 1:11). Bernard identifies with the Apostles, even though he was so recently wondering how he, who was not part of Jesus’ historical entourage, might ever be considered a partaker of Jesus’ final moment of Ascension. Bernard encourages himself and his audience that surely Jesus will come, as promised, on the final Day of Judgment. Coming ascendant and no longer humbled, Jesus will judge the living and the dead, and he will resurrect the bodies of his own according to his most glorious body, no longer clothed in the weakness of flesh but appearing with power and majesty.¹⁰² The abbot concludes in the first person, “I, too, shall look upon him, but not just yet; I will see him, but not close by, thus in order that this second glorification might clearly outshine the prior glorification by excellent glory.”¹⁰³

Bernard’s stated anxiety in this section of the sermon is somewhat rhetorical, as Bernard seeks to capture the prevailing pathos of his audience, but it is no less real as a result of its rhetorical effect. In Bernard’s Third Sermon on the Ascension, which is rather more somber than the Second Sermon, Bernard similarly introduces the occasion with another expression of

¹⁰¹ “Verumtamen quid mihi et sollemnitatibus istis? Quis me consolabitur, Domine Iesu, qui te non vidi cruce suspensum, plagis lividum, pallidum morte...”; Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 320; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 128.

¹⁰² Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 320; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 128.

¹⁰³ “Intuebor et ego eum, sed non modo; videbo eum, sed non prope, ita ut haec secunda glorificatio prioro glorificationi propter excellentem gloriam manifeste praeluceat, (cf. 2 Cor. 3:10)”; Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 320f.; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 129.

palpable anxiety as he worries that perhaps we on earth can only ever gaze towards the holy city so long as we remain trapped and mired in our sinfulness:

Today the Lord of heaven pierced through the heights of heaven with heavenly power, casting off infirm flesh as if a mere cloud, he donned the garb of glory... the Wisdom of God returned to the place of wisdom, where all understand and seek out the good with the most penetrating intellect, the most readied affect in order “to hear the voice of his words.” But we are in this place, where wickedness is manifest and wisdom is lacking because “the body which is corrupted burdens the soul, and the earthly container suppresses the mind with many concerns.”¹⁰⁴

By the end of this sermon, however, Bernard’s exhortation to his brothers changes, becoming more optimistic and looking to the community as a house of the Holy Spirit:

Today, dear ones, is the day when the Bridegroom is taken from us, and not without some disquiet of our spirits. But it is for this purpose, that he may send to us the Spirit of Truth. Let us cry out and pray that [the Spirit] should deem us worthy,¹⁰⁵ or rather prepare us, and fill up this house where we reside. Not so much upheaval, but that his anointing might teach about all things. And thus, both clarified understanding and purified affection may come to us and may make its household among us.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ “Hodie caelorum Dominus caelorum alta caelesti potentia penetravit, et infirma carnis tamquam nubila quaedam excutens, induit stolam gloriae. ... Rediit ad regionem sapientiae Sapientia Dei, ubi omnes bonum et intelligunt et requirunt, intellectu perspicacissimi, affectu paratissimi *ad audiendam vocem sermonum eius* (Ps. 102:20). Nos autem in regione ista sumus, ubi plurimum est malitiae, sapientiae parum, quia *corpus quod corrumpitur aggravat animam, et deprimit terrena inhabitatio sensum multa cogitantem* (Wisdom 9:15)”; Sermon 3.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 131. For Kienzle’s translation, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 37.

¹⁰⁵ Recall from above that the Apostles were “not yet deemed worthy” to follow Christ in his procession to the right hand of God.

¹⁰⁶ “Quia igitur, carissimi, hodierna dies est, in qua Sponsus aufertur a nobis, et non sine tumultu aliquo animorum nostrorum, ad hoc tamen ut mittat nobis Spiritum veritatis, ploremus et oremus, ut dignos nos inveniatur, vel potius efficiatur, et repleatur domus ista, ubi sumus sedentes, quatenus non vexatio, sed unctio eius doceat nos de omnibus, sicque, et intellectu clarificato, et affectu purificato, veniat ad nos et apud nos faciat mansionem”; Sermon 3.9, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 136. For Kienzle’s translation, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 42.

Bernard's expression of hope maintains some of his initial anxiety. Bernard never presents the image of the monastic community as a "heavenly Jerusalem" as a completed and finalized act such that the monks are, both in essence and in deed, saints. As with Philip above, even as Bernard locates Philip as a "citizen among the saints and a member of the household of God" nevertheless the preacher asks that Alexander fulfill his requests on behalf of the novice so that Philip's "service of the heart" may not be imperiled by his lingering wrongdoings on earth. Even though Bernard presents Cistercian monks, more so than other human beings, as those who dwell closer to holiness because they reside within a permanently liminal space and state between earth and heaven, their experience of liminality is neither one of completion nor of perfection in this present life. The monks must eventually "reintegrate" with the supernal society, but this remains a future event. Thus, the monastic liminal state offers consolation alongside anxiety, and Bernard captures this ambivalence by using language of both assurance and uncertainty. Although the monks are not yet living in their eschatological home, they maintain hope and act under the assurance that "being deemed worthy," the Holy Spirit shall make his home with them "today" just as his Spirit came to the Apostles during Pentecost.

As is typical of monastic sermons, Bernard's Second Sermon on the Ascension concludes by turning the moral lessons of the discourse into exhortations for proper action. Bernard asks his brothers to "persevere in the training (*disciplina*) which you have undertaken, so that, through humility, you might ascend to exaltation, for this is the only way."¹⁰⁷ In order to ascend like

¹⁰⁷ "Propterea, dilectissimi, perseverate in disciplina quam suscepistis, (cf. Hebrews 12:7), ut per humilitatem ad sublimitatem ascendatis, qui haec via, et non alia praeter ipsam"; Kienzle, "The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon," 321; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 130.

Christ, Bernard argues, you must follow the life of Christ.¹⁰⁸ Thus Bernard exhorts his brothers to go forth and endeavor to ascend, though it may be hard, because such is the path to becoming like God. For unlike some, who require that God should lead them along the path, or others, who willingly praise God but lack full devotion, or still others, who ascend only partway (like Paul taken up to the “third heaven”), Bernard wants his brethren to be among the blessed who follow Christ wherever he may lead and who endure the hardships along the way with their eyes focused upon the mountain top.¹⁰⁹ In their life of Christ-like imitation (*imitatio Christi*), the Cistercian community must climb up the mountain and ascend, like Christ, into God, just as Philip had to follow the path of the Ark into the Temple in order to become, like his monastic brothers, a citizen among the saints.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ In each of his sermons on the Ascension, Bernard makes this crucial point at least once. In his Fourth Sermon, Bernard makes his strongest case for the position that “it was right for Christ to descend, in order that we might teach ourselves to ascend” (Sic enim oportebat Christum descendere, ut nos ascendere doceremur); Sermon 4.3, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 139. Here too he discusses, as he does in the Second Sermon just above, that many begin the climb, but few are able to follow Christ truly and to the end. In the Fourth Sermon Bernard argues that Christ’s actions of descent and ascent parallel the Fall of Satan and the Fall of Adam who, in their pride, sought first to ascend but fell instead (see esp. Sermon 4.4–5). For additional discussion on this element of Bernard’s Ascension theology, see Leclercq, “The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard,” 9–16, esp. 13.

¹⁰⁹ Bernard exclaims, “Beatus qui ubique te ducem habet, Domine Iesu...”; Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 321; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 130.

¹¹⁰ In one of the three shorter, *De diversis*, sermons on the Ascension, Bernard tells his brothers that the early Church, after the Ascension of the Lord, exhibited three principal virtues: magnanimity, longanimity, and unanimity. According to Bernard, the Cistercian *conversatio* provides these three virtues in superabundance. As a result, “the heavenly Jerusalem wishes to be restored to souls who lack nothing in the magnitude of faith by undertaking the burden of Christ, [to souls who lack nothing] in the longitude of hope in persevering, and [to souls who lack nothing] in the association of love (*caritatis*), which is the bond of perfection” (Evidens fuit magnanimitas in conversatione nostra; sit etiam in consummatione longanimitas, sit unanimitas in conversatione. Huiusmodi siquidem animabus caelestis illa Ierusalem desiderat instaurari, quibus nec fide magnitudo desit in suscipiendo onere Christi, nec longitudo spei in persistendo, nec caritatis iunctura, *quod est vinculum perfectionis*, [Colossians 3:14]); identified by Leclercq

CONCLUSION: FROM WITHIN THE MONASTERY TO ASCEND INTO GOD

The power of ritual and liturgical analogy or identity must not be underestimated. The union of action, exegesis, and tradition that Bernard creates in his Ascension sermons, set alongside his institution of a procession, must have held real consequence upon the spiritual lives of his brethren. As his monks found themselves immersed each day in an exegetically-constructed sacred space that served as a representation of the heavenly Jerusalem on earth—an island of holiness in a profane world—Bernard’s interpretive parallelism between their own “happy procession” (*felix processio*) and Christ’s triumphal exaltation to the right hand of God established a powerful experiential metaphor. The fact that Bernard described Philip’s “pilgrimage” to Clairvaux in a similar way, as a kind of holy procession through the gates of the city and up to the Mercy Seat of God, further suggests that Bernard’s words and abbatial decisions were neither haphazardly offered nor meaningless in their correlation; rather, evidence points to a consistent exegetical nexus of ideas within Bernard’s theological portrayal of the Cistercian monastery, which he employed both in correspondence to the outside world and in internal discussions among his monks. This web of meaning, which functioned to unite the “textual community” via a shared understanding of *Christianitas* alongside shared ritual and liturgical activity, ensured that the Cistercian monks identified with the saints and the Apostles dwelling in the “heavenly Jerusalem” and anticipating the eschaton.¹¹¹

as Bernard of Clairvaux, *De diversis* 43.2 (but edited in *Sancti Bernardi Opera* as *In Ascensione Domini*, Sermon 5.2); see, Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 150.

¹¹¹ John van Engen has argued that medieval historians, who have tended to use “*Christianitas*” as a term for ecclesiastical polity, have used the term problematically. He argues instead that medieval Christians understood *Christianitas* as those things which make one Christian. See, John Van Engen, “The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 539–541.

In the case of Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension*, I do not think that Bernard's address was intended for an audience outside of his community, certainly not primarily. Jean Leclercq has argued that Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension* show his aspiration for union with God and, according to Bernard's own words, the fulfillment of such an aspiration requires a supportive community that is able, collectively, to produce a whole and singular heart from a collection of broken ones.¹¹² Although each monk must make an individual journey up the mountain, Cistercian *communitas* created the sacred environs of the "heavenly Jerusalem" necessary for these monks to seek their Lord and to pursue ascent into God from within their "borders of peace." Bernard expressed his biblical and exegetical theology related to the "monastery as Jerusalem" outside of the Cistercian community in his letter to Alexander, and Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension* present a similar interpretive project to the monks inside the walls of the cloister. Both cases demonstrate a coherent program of ascension within a communally constructed sacred space known as the "heavenly Jerusalem." This same exegetical framework recurs in Bernard's writings that straddle the boundary between the sacred and the profane worlds of the twelfth century.

FROM CLAIRVAUX TO JERUSALEM: BERNARD RESPONDS TO THE AGE OF CRUSADE

The Prologue of the *Rule of Benedict* describes the monastery as a "school for the Lord's service" (*dominici scola servitii*). Martha Newman notes that *scola* has the implication of both a place of education and a place for teaching martial skill.¹¹³ Carolingian Benedictines, she argues, "generally ignored implications about interior education and instead concentrated on the

¹¹² See, Leclercq, "The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard," 15f. Cf. Sermon 6.5, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 152.

¹¹³ See *Rule of Benedict*, Prologue (section 45) and Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 21.

proper behavior and ritual actions of a military corps.”¹¹⁴ Cluniac monks, for example, given their commitment to perpetual praise (*laus perennis*) and to endless liturgies for the dead, conceptualized themselves as a spiritual vanguard who were fighting against the encroachment of demonic forces in this world even as they were seeking to rescue souls in the world to come.¹¹⁵ The Cistercians were different. The cultural context of the early-twelfth century led the emergent Cistercians to develop an alternative reading of the *Rule of Benedict* in their “return” to strict observance. Newman writes that these early Cistercians, “emphasized a less dominant element within the Benedictine Rule: they stressed interior psychological development and, as a result, reworked the earlier interpretation of both the military and the educative aspects of the monastic scola.”¹¹⁶

The interiorization of the spiritual life was an ongoing process during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Whereas the collective penitential acts of monastic communities during the ninth through eleventh centuries were considered efficacious precisely *because* of their visibility, theological developments preceding the Cistercian Order increasingly privileged an interiorized and individualized understanding of the prayers and the liturgy in order to ensure their efficacy. In short, the outward manifestation of the deed required introspection, internalized knowledge, skill, and resolve on the part of the ritual actor in order to be truly successful. Unlike Carthusian

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Barbara Rosenwein offers an interesting perspective of the tenth-century Cluniac liturgical style. She writes that the language of spiritual warfare used by the monks during the tenth century, and the notion of prayers helping God combat the devil on behalf of human souls, reflected efforts to gain some control over the warrior class within a society where the centralized authority had broken down. For reasons somewhat different than my own, Rosenwein presents the development and the program of Cluniac monasticism as a direct result of the rise and fall of Carolingian influence in Western Europe; see, Barbara Rosenwein, “Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression,” *Viator* 2 (1972): 129–158, esp. 152–157.

¹¹⁶ Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 21f.

communities (first founded in 1084), which gave up almost all outward liturgical functions in order to maximize time devoted to interior development (creating a kind of aggregation of hermits), the Cistercian Order chose to reduce the liturgical commitments established at Cluny and to increase time for introspection during periods of manual labor and *lectio divina* in order to create a balance between the communal and the individual religious life.

Since the Cistercians did not accept child oblates and since they drew their members from the learned classes, the types of people brought into the Order tended to be unmarried young male knights or clerics, precisely the “most restless and ambitious element in northern French society.”¹¹⁷ The language of the *scola* for students and soldiers pursuing a common goal in service to individual motivations, passions, and goals, therefore, fit societal trends, fulfilled societal needs, and accorded well with those attracted to the Order. These new members, in turn, filled the choirs with educated pugilists eager to fight in service of their ideals, whether the battles be earthly or heavenly.¹¹⁸

BERNARD’S *PARABOLAE*: JERUSALEM AS SACRED CITY AND MONASTIC REFUGE

Bernard of Clairvaux, who was eager to identify his monastic settlement as a vision of the heavenly city, wrote parables (of which there are eight) that were set within the secular context of kings, knights, and glorious battles but that conveyed in this context spiritual truths.¹¹⁹ Of

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 24–29.

¹¹⁸ Newman writes: “Inherent in the idea of monastery as *scola* was the image of the monk as soldier. The picture of a Christian fighting in a divine army had its source in Paul’s epistles and was further enhanced by the warlike language of the psalms that formed the nucleus of the monastic liturgy. ... Nonetheless, the meanings given to this image reflect specific historical conditions and illustrate changes in monastic life”; Ibid., 29.

¹¹⁹ The *Sitz im Leben* of Bernard’s parables has not been well established. Mette Birkedal Bruun’s work on the *parabola*e represents the greatest single work on the subject, and even she remains uncertain of their exact context. She suggests a generalized monastic audience (the texts circulated among Cistercian and Benedictine houses) and a compositional range between 1115–

these eight parables, the first two best illustrate his use of municipal metaphors to contrast earth and heaven.

In his first parable, Bernard describes various stages and states of spiritual conversion—first, he observes, one is stupid and sluggish, next rash and bold, later timid, finally wise. He relates one’s spiritual progression towards perfection by painting the scene of a rebellious prince who is captured by the Devil and rescued by Fear, Hope, Prudence, Temperance, and the great knight, Fortitude. Saved by the embodied virtues, the wayward prince is brought to the castle of Wisdom, a city-castle-monastery, and there the prince endures the trials of the hard-hearted Pharaoh, who besieges the city. Charity, however, vanquishes the earthly Pharaoh.¹²⁰

Living after the Fall, Bernard’s parable of the errant child relates to all Christians, and his warlike and feudal setting captures a ubiquitous feature of the lives of his twelfth-century audience. Yet, the presence of the mothering castle of Wisdom, and Charity, the beloved of the father, makes clear what kinds of “sons” are truly rescued. Indeed, the detail that Wisdom stands open to all, but that her porter stands on the threshold in order to choose between the worthy and

1153. The *Parables* in Mabillon’s 1667 edition of Bernard were placed among the *spuria* and the *dubia*, so their lingers some suspicion over their authenticity; however, most modern scholars accept the texts as coming from Bernard; see, Bruun, *Parables*, 138–140. Kienzle compares Bernard’s *Parabola*e to Hildegard’s moral teachings based upon gospel narratives; see her “Introduction” to Hildegard of Bingen, *Homilies on the Gospels*, trans. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Cistercian Studies Series 241 (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2011), 14–16.

¹²⁰ Parable 1.4 (*De filio regis*), in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Parabola*e, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 6.2 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1972), 264. This parable is discussed more fully in Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 30f. A summary and a discussion of the parable may be found in Bruun, *Parables*, 167–206. See also, Kienzle’s “Introduction” to Hildegard of Bingen, *Homilies on the Gospels*, 16; and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “Hildegard of Bingen’s Gospel Homilies and Her Exegesis of the Parable of the Prodigal Son,” in *Im Angesicht Gottes suche der mensch sich selbst* (Mainz, 1998).

the unworthy, depicts a clear image of Cistercian standards for the spiritual élite.¹²¹ As Bruun writes: “What does the castle of Wisdom signify? Basically it points to a position of apparent monastically tinged refuge amidst dangers and attacks from vices.”¹²²

The second of Bernard’s *Parables* begins with the kings of Babylon and Jerusalem embroiled in an endless battle.¹²³ While Jerusalem stands besieged, Prayer penetrates the mysteries of heaven and rouses the King, who announces to his soldiers that “the voice of the turtle dove is heard in our land” (Song of Songs 2:12).¹²⁴ Charity, presented here as the powerful duke of the king, departs once more to rescue the king’s lost and kidnapped child. Reaching the prince’s castle, Charity rages forth with his train of virtues, and he annihilates the hellish forces of Babylon.¹²⁵ As with the first parable, Bernard presents his monastic audience with a narrative of cosmic warfare that both parallels their lived experiences prior to their monastic vows and assures them that they, like the prince, have found safe refuge in the city of Wisdom.¹²⁶

The presentation of the monastery as castle Wisdom or as Jerusalem itself in these parables reinforces Bernard’s description of Clairvaux in his letter to Alexander and in his

¹²¹ Parable 1.5, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Parabolae*, 264; discussed also in Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 30. Newman observes that the Cistercians, Bernard especially, were somewhat selective in terms of whom they would permit to join their community. Bernard was known to reject men, even other monks, if he felt that they lacked the spiritual strength to persevere in Cistercian austerity; see *Ibid.*, 130.

¹²² Bruun, *Parables*, 198.

¹²³ For a more complete discussion of this parable, see *Ibid.*, 207–227.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 208.

¹²⁵ Parable 2.7 (*De conflictu duorum regum*), in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Parabolae*, 273; cited in Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 31.

¹²⁶ On a more practical level, Martha Newman suggests that Bernard’s parables would likely have been effective didactic tools since they would have added an element of excitement to chapter. Moreover, his parables often address the tension between fathers and sons, which would have been a topic of considerable relevance when considering eleventh- and twelfth-century inheritance patterns. Indeed, issues of inheritance may have directed why certain (disinherited) monks were hearing Bernard’s parables in the first place; see, Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 31.

Sermons on the Ascension. Yet, while this exegetical “Jerusalem” may represent Clairvaux in a number of Bernard’s exegetical works, this does not mean that Bernard remained unaware of the plight of the earthly city, which was first captured and then lost during the initial decades of the twelfth century. In addition to some of his *Parables*, which used images of holy war to present a moralized mode of conduct, Bernard also entered the political realm of crusade by establishing a theological justification for the Knights Templar. In *De laude novae militiae* (*In Praise of the New Knighthood*), Bernard contrasts the distinctly Cistercian kind of sacred space described thus far with another kind of sacred space existing outside the cloister walls and within a spiritualized geography of the Holy Land.

“IN PRAISE OF THE NEW KNIGHTHOOD”: THE TEMPLARS AT THE TEMPLE OF GOD

Asked to write *In Praise of the New Knighthood* by Hugh de Payens, one of the founders of the Knights Templar, Bernard composed *De laude novae militiae* between 1128 and 1131.¹²⁷ Thus, Bernard wrote this text after Jerusalem had been successfully captured by the efforts of the First Crusade, and during a time in which travel to the Holy Land, while still dangerous, represented a potential undertaking for sufficiently mobile members of Christian society (people such as merchants, knights, and other members of the nobility). The events and territorial losses leading to the Second Crusade had yet to transpire, and it would be some time before Bernard’s pupil would become Pope Eugenius III (1145). In this interim, Bernard described this “new

¹²⁷ Conrad Greenia notes in his translation that, “Hugh of Payens (Payns) was a relative of Bernard. He started the Knights of the Temple in 1118 with eight companions and was their Grand Master until his death in 1136”; Bernard of Clairvaux, “In Praise of the New Knighthood,” in *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux 7: Treatises III*, trans. Conrad Greenia, Cistercian Fathers Series 19 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1977), 127.

knighthood” as one that “ceaselessly wages a twofold war both against flesh and blood and against a spiritual army of evil in heaven.”¹²⁸

Bernard characterized the Knights Templar (the “Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon”) as an honorable order whose connection to warfare was one inextricably attached to inner repentance and to personal transformation.¹²⁹ Indeed, Bernard writes that these knights could “kill fearlessly and be killed even more fearlessly, for [the knight] serves Christ when he kills and serves himself when he dies.”¹³⁰ Describing the Templars like the Cistercians, as those who shunned earthly ornamentation (jewels, gold, silks, etc.)¹³¹ in favor of an austere life of faith, Bernard refers to them as both monks and soldiers. Nevertheless, Bernard is quick to maintain the superior spiritual prowess of the cloistered (Cistercian) monk in comparison to any member of any other societal class or stratum.¹³²

Cistercian absence and Templar presence in Jerusalem influenced the way in which Bernard presented the Templars vis-à-vis the his own Order. Certain Cistercians, particularly some monks associated with Morimond alongside Arnold, their abbot, had designs for a

¹²⁸ Cf. Ephesians 6:12; Ibid., 129.

¹²⁹ See, for example, Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 184. J. Prawer writes that “the new knight fights for the sake of the salvation of his soul and the love of his Creator. His supreme virtue and essential quality is his vocation for martyrdom: in fact, he is a permanent candidate for martyrdom. Martyrdom is the supreme goal of the knight’s life. The Order of the Temple is the collectivity of knights dedicated to martyrdom”; Joshua Prawer, *Histoire du Royaume latin de Jérusalem* (CNRS Editions, 2007), 349; translated and discussed by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky in his “Introduction” to Bernard of Clairvaux, “In Praise of the New Knighthood,” 121.

¹³⁰ “Miles, inquam, Christi secures interimit, interit securior. Sibi praestat cum interit, Christo cum interimit”; *De laude novae militiae* 3.4, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Tractatus et Opuscula*, 217. Quoted and translated in Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 185.

¹³¹ Such things, held by “worldly knights,” Bernard regards as “monstrous error”; see, Bernard of Clairvaux, “In Praise of the New Knighthood,” 132.

¹³² *De laude novae militiae* 4.8, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Tractatus et Opuscula*, 221. Newman writes that, although Bernard seemed to blur lines that he tends to keep distinct, he nevertheless depicted the Knights Templar as an austere order organizing itself to “best aid their salvation while fulfilling their allotted social role”; Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 185.

Cistercian presence in the Holy Land as early as 1124.¹³³ Bernard, however, opposed this kind of “crusader-like” activity for monks, especially the white monks, although he did offer some degree of encouragement both for the Premonstratensians (canons regular, founded by Bernard’s friend Norbert in 1120)¹³⁴ and for the Knights Templar who, as noted above, straddled the line between monk and knight.¹³⁵

In chapter five of *De laude novae militiae*, Bernard describes the Temple of Solomon, the headquarters of the Knights Templar. The Temple, he observes, has lost the material (and perishable) glories of its past, but it “remains no less glorious.” He explains:

All the beauty and gracious charming adornment of its present counterpart is the religious fervor of its occupants and by their well-disciplined behavior. In the former, one could contemplate all sorts of beautiful colors, while in the latter one is able to venerate all sorts of virtues and good works. Indeed holiness is the fitting ornament for God’s house (cf. Psalm 92:5). One is able to delight there in

¹³³ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 52.

¹³⁴ In fact, Bernard wrote to Abbot Hugh of Prémontré around 1150 in order to resolve certain tensions that had developed between the two communities. In his letter, Bernard recalls that Baldwin II, Crusader King of Jerusalem, offered St Samuel to the Cistercians in 1131 but that he had given the parcel and some money to the Premonstratensians in order to establish themselves on the site instead of the Cistercians. Bernard cites his gift of this land in addition to the site of Prémontré, which he asserts was originally his, as compelling reasons against any discord between himself and Hugh; see Letter 253, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1974, 149. For an English translation of the letter, see Mabillon, *Life and Works of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*, II: 735–743.

¹³⁵ Bernard observes: “When someone strongly resists a foe in the flesh, relying solely on the strength of the flesh, I would hardly remark it, since this is common enough. And when war is waged by spiritual strength against vices or demons, this, too, is nothing remarkable, praiseworthy as it is, for the world is full of monks. But when the one sees a man powerfully girding himself with both swords and nobly marking his belt, who would not consider it worthy of all wonder, the more so since it has been hitherto unknown? He is truly a fearless knight and secure on every side, for his soul is protected by the armor of faith just as his body is protected by armor of steel”; Bernard of Clairvaux, “In Praise of the New Knighthood,” 129f. Greenia notes to the opening line of *De laude novae militiae* that “this was indeed a new knighthood, the idea of men consecrated by religious vows bearing arms was utterly novel”; *Ibid.*, 129.

splendid merits rather than in shining marble, and to be captivated by pure hearts rather than by girded paneling.¹³⁶

Bernard defines the physical abode of the Knights Templar by utilizing a similar exegetical maneuver to the one employed in the *Apologia*, in Letter 64, and in the *Sermons on the Ascension*: he establishes a contrast between two ends of a theological dichotomy—physicality and spirituality—in order to shift categories while imposing a judgment of value. Like his consistent depiction of the Cistercian Order, the Knights Templar are more holy than other knights both because they are less physically-minded and more spiritually-focused and because their holiness is connected to a community rather than to a place.

When Bernard makes a judgment of value in those of his texts that discuss the “heavenly Jerusalem,” he does so by comparing “things,” which he regards as physical, and “communal bonds,” which he regards as spiritual. Worldly knights, non-Cistercian monks (particularly the monks of Cluny), and members of the world outside of the cloister remain profoundly enmeshed in physicality; that is, they persist in their obsession with the “earthly container [that] suppresses the mind with many concerns.”¹³⁷ Furthermore, their obsession with the “earthly container”—the body and its desires—is made apparent by their preoccupation with physical objects, such as gold, gems, silks, “colors,” marbles, etc. Cistercian monks, and here the Knights Templar, however, are especially marked by their focus on their *community* and on the cultivation of holiness among their members. In this way, Bernard distinguishes the physical materials of the old Temple from the people of new knighthood now living in the Temple ruins: both are

¹³⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, “In Praise of the New Knighthood,” 142.

¹³⁷ “*deprimit terrena inhabitatio sensum multa cogitantem* (Wisdom 9:15)”; quoted by Bernard in Sermon 3.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 131.

glorious, but the latter is markedly more so since these knights are “pure hearts rather than girded paneling.”

Even as Bernard praises the holy *communitas* of the “new knighthood,” which quickly established itself as an order of knights helpful to the way and the to cause of lay pilgrims travelling the road to Jerusalem, he also provides a spiritual geography of the Holy Land for those reading his treatise. Beginning in Bethlehem, Bernard guides his reader across those places most important to the life and the death of Christ; he lingers the longest on the Holy Sepulchre.¹³⁸ The spiritual geography of pilgrimage and place is important to those for whom the act of crusading remained an important cultural memory but no longer a possibility. Bernard’s geography provided stations of “remembrance” that connected distant locations with biblical narratives in order to permit those incapable of travel to join the Knights Templar in their semi-religious actions. This geography did not, however, apply to Bernard’s monks.

Consistent unto himself, Bernard maintains a strong distinction between those for whom pilgrimage represented the pinnacle of spiritual development and those whose pilgrimage has already concluded with citizenship among the saints in the heavenly Jerusalem. As edifying as a spiritualized geography of the Holy Land may prove for the laity, it remains milk compared to the bread broken within the monastic “Jerusalem.”¹³⁹ While discussing this spiritualized journey of meditations on important spiritual lessons, Martha Newman writes that “this itinerary paralleled the process of spiritual development and redemption that formed part of the crusading

¹³⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux, “In Praise of the New Knighthood,” 146–147, 154–163.

¹³⁹ As Newman observes: “Cistercian monks, who did not need to go on crusade because they bore an inner cross on their hearts, had the strength to model their life on the life of Jesus and follow the difficult path it demanded, but crusaders, pilgrims, and even the Knights Templar followed the easier path marked by the hope offered by Jesus’ death rather than the demands of his life”; Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 187.

ideology; but it also further demonstrated the Cistercian's separation of monastic and lay sanctity, for its emphasis is different from that in works composed primarily for a Cistercian audience."¹⁴⁰

When Bernard took up the cause to preach the Second Crusade in 1147 at the urging of Pope Eugenius III (1080–1153), he did so before a crowd so large that the venue had to be moved from Vézelay to a field outside of the town.¹⁴¹ Quickly depleting his supply of cloth crosses, Bernard tore his own robes to provide more while he urged Christians to cease fighting other Christians in favor of a common enemy. “Now you have, O brave knights, indeed you have, O warlike men” he cried, “a place where you may fight without danger, where it is both glorious to conquer and profitable to die!”¹⁴² For Bernard, the quest for Jerusalem was not so much a pilgrimage of recapture (for God could protect his Holy Land) but an opportunity for the laity to find the spiritual comforts associated with martyrdom.¹⁴³ To knights and to merchants living in the profane world, Bernard preached a path to spiritual glory combined with papal indulgence. To monks within the sacred “heavenly Jerusalem,” however, Bernard explicitly excluded involvement.¹⁴⁴

CONCLUSION: HOME AT THE FOOTSTOOL OF GOD

When the author of Ephesians wrote “for you are no longer guests or visitors, but you are citizens among the saints and members of the household of God,” his purpose was to explain to

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 186.

¹⁴¹ Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 42.

¹⁴² “Habes nunc, fortis miles, habes, vir bellicose, ubi dimices absque periculo, ubi et vincere gloria et mori lucrum”; Letter 363, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera* 8 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1977), 315.

¹⁴³ Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 184.

¹⁴⁴ See also Letter 511, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, 1977, 470.

the community at Ephesus that a wall had been broken down between God's once chosen people, the Jews, and the Gentiles, who "have been brought near by the blood of Jesus Christ" (Ephesians 2:13). By his act of salvific sacrifice, Jesus "made the two groups one and destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility" (v. 14). Bernard's approach to these verses differs from their plain sense meaning within the New Testament.

Rather than reading these verses as the deconstruction of a barrier, Bernard interprets Ephesians to establish a boundary between a profane world and his sacred monastic community. In so doing, Bernard created for his brethren a sacred space that maintained the sacrality of Christ's theophany in Cistercian *communitas*, eschewing dependence upon physical markers of holiness such as specialized architectures, liturgical objects, or saintly relics. He described his community as citizens of Jerusalem, albeit the "Jerusalem up above," as members of the household of God, and as a holy temple built together that welcomes the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who proceeds from the Father and the Son after the Ascension. Just as a building, such as a Temple, stands only when each stone supports and is supported by another stone and only when the whole edifice is united to the cornerstone, the community of Clairvaux was only able to pursue its program of individualized ascent when each and every monk supports his brother under the leadership and guidance of Christ.

Bernard's interpretation of Ephesians in his letter to Alexander on behalf of Philip, in his *Sermons on the Ascension*, and in some of his other writings mentioned above represents a unique invention deriving from the reforming spirit of the eleventh and twelfth centuries and from the interpretive and prescriptive ideal of the *vita apostolica*. We do not find such interpretations earlier in material coming from Cluny. This is not because the monks of Cluny lacked the exegetical wherewithal for such ideas but because the historical context into which

Cluny came into being differed substantially from that of Cîteaux and Clairvaux. While both monastic communities read a common set of scriptures, the shift from “Old Testament” spirituality to “New Testament” spirituality transformed the rules of engagement with the text. Both monastic communities used exegesis to respond to problems contemporary with their establishment, and both communities presented their monasteries as sacred spaces within which God’s divine power irrupts into the world. The methods that they used and the sacred spaces that they defined are essentially different, however, because the needs of the brethren changed over time.

Cluniac dependence upon physical objects for the construction of sacred space was suspicious to the strict reformers of Cîteaux, who sought to establish themselves in “places of horror and vast wilderness” with austerity and poverty as principal virtues while each member of their community collectively pursued an individualized project of ascent into God. The Cistercian emphasis on the individual pursuit of salvation within their monastery, which was made sacred as a result of the holiness of its members, likewise appeared distasteful to the members of Cluny, who focused upon their role as religious men who fought, mediated, and prayed for the collective souls of the Christians outside of their holy environs. Whereas the monks of Cluny focused on the creation of a sacred space that best suited their roles as supplicants for souls still mired in sin while they themselves stood in the vestibule of heaven, the Cistercian monks left behind the care of the dead in order to pursue a pathway of ascension leading through the “gates of salvation” in order that they might stand “at the footstool of God.”

The theological writings of Bernard of Clairvaux provide the clearest and most influential articulations of the differences between the exegetical projects of Cluny and Cîteaux because Bernard’s thought was formative to the Cistercian Order. Bernard presented a consistent

interpretation of the Cistercian monastery as a “heavenly Jerusalem,” and he created and utilized this sacred space as a holy locus from which the members of his Order might pursue their ultimate goal in Christ. Although the means by which the Cistercians sought to ascend were embedded in the historical and cultural context of their age, exegetes, such as Bernard of Clairvaux, used the interpretive web that united the brethren as a “textual community” to join the Order to the narrative of salvation which began in Genesis and which will conclude at the eschaton. Thus, while the Cistercians remained grounded in history, the sacred bridge created within their monasteries permitted them to become “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God” so that “having been built together, [they might] ascend into a holy temple in the Lord.”

III

Raising a Temple of “Living Stones”

Coming to him, the living stone—indeed rejected by men, yet chosen by God and honored by him—be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. As Scripture maintains: “Behold! I set a stone in Zion, a cornerstone, chosen and precious, and he who will trust in it, shall never be brought to ruin.”

For you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people acquired [by God] so that you might declare his mighty works, he who called you from darkness into his marvelous light. You who were once not a people, now you are the people of God; once you obtained no mercy, now mercy seeks after you.¹

Bernard of Clairvaux, when forming his idea of the monastery as a “heavenly Jerusalem” that represented a sacred space on earth by virtue of the community of monks living there, focused on the words of Ephesians (2:19–22) in order to present the members of the Cistercian community as “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God.” Consistent in his interpretation to audiences both inside and outside of the Cistercian cloister, Bernard explained that the monks living within Clairvaux collectively represented a sacred edifice that, “having been built together, ascends into a holy temple in the Lord” with Christ as the “chief cornerstone.” Thus, because of the monastic community, the cloister became a dwelling place for God, a sacred space and a site for ascent into God.

¹ “Ad quem accedentes lapidem vivum, ab hominibus quidem reprobatur, a Deo autem electum, et honorificatum: et ipsi tamquam lapides vivi superaedificamini, domus spiritualis, sacerdotium sanctum, offerre spirituales hostias, acceptabiles Deo per Jesum Christum. Propter quod continet Scriptura: Ecce pono in Sion lapidem summum angularem, electum, pretiosum: et qui crediderit in eum, non confundetur. ... Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus acquisitionis: ut virtutes annuntietis eius qui de tenebris vos vocavit in admirabile lumen suum. Qui aliquando non populus, nunc autem populus Dei: qui non consecuti misericordiam, nunc autem misericordiam consecuti” (1 Peter 2:4–7, 9–10).

The First Epistle of Peter echoes the architectural language of Ephesians in its presentation of the Christian community as “living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood,” ascending towards God while secured by Christ as its “cornerstone.” The theology of this New Testament epistle developed around the words that Jesus proclaimed to its eponymous author in the Gospel of Matthew (16:18): “you are Peter (*petrus*) and on this rock I shall build my Church.” Likewise, its author recalls Peter’s sermon in Acts 4, where Peter, “filled with the Holy Spirit” before the Sanhedrin, identified Jesus with the words of Psalm 117:22—“the stone which the builders rejected has become the cornerstone.”² Quoting from Psalm 117:22 (Acts 4:11) and from a version of Isaiah 28:16, the author identifies Jesus as the foretold and eschatologically significant “cornerstone” which provides the necessary structural integrity to erect a Temple that can never be brought to ruin. Unlike the Temple of Jerusalem, for which Jesus wept— for he knew that not a single stone would remain on top of another (Mark 13:2)—the author of 1 Peter claims, like the author of Ephesians, that Jesus’ community of “living stones” will endure until, and past, the end of time.

The use of language and exegetical structures to sanctify physical constructs represents certain challenges that are not present when employing physical “holy” objects as the termini for demarcating spatial sanctity. The establishment and the maintenance of a physical location as “sacred” is the product of complex and ongoing negotiations between the caretakers living within the holy grounds and those who dwell in the profane space without; objects hold argumentative force more concretely than words, memories, and conversations.³ According to

² “Lapis quem reprobaverunt aedificantes factus est in caput anguli.”

³ The combination of physical and interpretive markers would seem to be most effective for maintaining spatial and religious boundaries. For example, David Nirenberg cites the conduction of violent games among children at physical landmarks marking territorial boundaries as a possible precursor to Christian violence against Jews during Holy Week. He argues that the violence of the games at border sites, meant to instill boundary markers in the growing

the monks of Cluny, although liturgy was a central aspect of their *conversatio*, the site of Cluny remained sacred with or without their ritual presence. For the monks of the Cistercian Order, however, sacrality and holiness represented dynamic processes requiring ongoing engagement between the “members of the household of God” and the “Jerusalem” within which they lived. In other words, Cistercian constructions of sacred space more fully relied on a rich and evolving nexus of liturgical celebration and exegetical investigation, shared among the “citizens” of the textual community, in order to maintain the bridge, that joined the earthly cloister and the heavenly city and allowed the monks to pursue their central endeavor of ascent.

TOWARDS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SACRED SPACE

In his article, “Staging Place/Space in the Eleventh-Century Monastic Practices,” Michal Kobialka distinguishes between place, which he describes as a physical/geographical location, and space, which he argues represents the practices undertaken within a place, in order to investigate the relationship between monastic site and monastic practice.⁴ This distinction proves helpful when considering space as the aggregate of a place and of the ritual and lived components within that domain because it makes it easier to distinguish among the various exegetical and interpretive arguments applied to a ritual site in order to transform a “place” into a

generation, was analogous to the way in which “Holy Week games may have served to beat the boundaries between Christian and Jew and to preserve them in memory”; David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 226.

⁴ Kobialka creates his place/space distinction by citing and reconceptualizing Michel de Certeau’s definitions of the same in *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1988); see, Michal Kobialka, “Staging Place/Space in the Eleventh-Century Monastic Practices,” in *Medieval Practices of Space*, ed. Barbara A. Hanawalt and Michal Kobialka, *Medieval Cultures* 23 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 128f. For a fuller presentation of Henri Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space* and Michel de Certeau’s *The Practice of Everyday Life* as these and similar works impact contemporary studies of Cistercian space, see Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries*, *Medieval Church Studies* 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 2–12.

sacred “space.” In light of the material covered in the last chapter regarding Bernard’s emphasis on people over place, however, it may be useful to reconsider the boundaries defining “space.”

Space, etymologically derived from the Latin noun *spatium*, denotes, in its most basic meanings, either a geographical area bounded by physical markers or a temporal interval punctuated by starting and ending points. In *Medieval Practices of Space*, Kobialka and Barbara Hanawalt suggest that we expand our definition and conception of space to include “perceived,” “conceived,” and “lived” spaces. Perceived space, or “spatial practice,” “embraces production and reproduction of each social formation”; conceived space, or “representations of space,” “are tied to the relations of production and to the order, hence knowledge, that these relations impose”; and lived space, or “representational spaces,” “embody complex symbolism dominating, by containing them, all senses and all bodies.”⁵ Thus, for example, Cluniac dependence upon strict hierarchical relations within their social structure as an analogue to the rightly ordered kingdom of God and their pursuit of building and transforming their grounds into a sacred space meant to rival great holy pilgrimage sites such as Rome or Jerusalem are both matters for which categories such as “spatial practice” and “representations of space” should prove helpful for investigation. The monks of Cluny used physical barriers within the monastery to create concentric circles of increasing holiness, and they grounded strict social hierarchies in the physical placements of the brothers in choir and at meals. Life at Cluny, taken as a whole, demonstrated the “complex symbolism” of “representational space” as Jennifer Harris explains in “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century.” The category of “representational space” proves useful likewise when considering how Bernard’s

⁵ Hanawalt and Kobialka suggest this triad based upon the work of Henri Lefebvre (*La Production de l’espace*, 1974); see, Barbara A. Hanawalt and Michal Kobialka, “Introduction,” in Barbara A. Hanawalt and Michal Kobialka, eds., *Medieval Practices of Space*, *Medieval Cultures* 23 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), ix.

Clairvaux may also be the “heavenly Jerusalem.” While Bernard does not provide much by way of detail regarding the physical construction of the cloister, he offers a wealth of information concerning the exegetical meaning of the space as a site that represents both physical and spiritual modalities for living.

Bernard of Clairvaux’s theology of the sacred community discussed in the last chapter informs the idea or category of “spatial exegesis,” even though Bernard does not overlay elements of “space” onto a “place” as one might expect. Bernard shows that exegetical considerations of space may be primary and therefore neither directly connected to nor dependent upon a particular “place” for them to have meaning. In this regard, we might then set aside physical “places” in order to investigate an exegete’s treatment of space or spatial elements within the interpreted source scripture or text. Thus, textual elements of limitation or construction (e.g., boundaries or building materials), elements of movement or procession (e.g. steps, roads, or courts), and elements of punctuation (e.g. designations of time such as seasons or hours) become interpretive aspects used to structure ways of knowing and understanding history, theology, and interpersonal relationships. Allow me to provide a quick example.

Sing, Choir of the New and Blessed City

According to the earliest manuscripts of the Cistercian hymnal studied by Chrysogonus Waddell, Cistercian monks would sing the tenth-century hymn of Fulbert of Chartres, “*Chorus novae Ierusalem*” (“Sing, Choir of New Jerusalem”), during the celebration of Easter. Thus, all would sing, “*soli polique patriam unam facit rem publicam*” (“He makes one community from the *patriam* of heaven and the *patriam* of earth”). *Patriam*, generally translated as “native land,” may also be translated as the “city of one’s origins.” In manuscripts later, but prior to 1147, Waddell also finds the inclusion of the seventh- or eighth-century hymn, “*Urbs beata Ierusalem*”

(“Blessed City of Jerusalem”). This hymn, which draws on themes from Ephesians 2:20, 1 Peter 2:5, and Revelation 21, begins “blessed city of Jerusalem, called a vision of peace, built in heaven from living stones, and crowned by the angels as a bride rejoicing” and continues to employ building metaphors until it concludes with the priests supplicating God in his Temple.⁶ The Cistercians were neither the first nor the only group of monks to sing songs about Jerusalem. Indeed, the monks of Cluny sang *Urbs beata Ierusalem* as part of their Easter liturgy.⁷ This song, in addition to Bede’s homilies (particularly on Luke 6:43–48, *Quia propitia divinitate*), represented a regular part of Cluniac festal celebration and an integral part of their metaphorical identification of Cluny to sacred locales.⁸ While the Cistercians were not unique in their choice of hymns, I argue that the Cistercian “textual community” experienced these songs differently because the words took on new meaning under another hermeneutic.

Following Bernard, Cistercians describing themselves as the “choir of New Jerusalem” would envision themselves among the saints, singing within the city of their citizenship as members of God’s household, a joyful throng of people and angels ushering Christ to the right hand of God as they celebrate his Ascension. On the other hand, the monks of Cluny were hyper-vigilant performers of the liturgy because they, too, understood themselves to be the “choir of the New Jerusalem”; however, their “choir” straddled the boundary between the two *patriae* of heaven and earth in order for them to sing effectively on behalf of those still fully

⁶ For further details on the developments of these hymns in the Cistercian liturgy, see Chrysogonus Waddell, *The Twelfth-Century Cistercian Hymnal*, Cistercian Liturgy Series 1–2 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1984), 2: 145, 232.

⁷ See, Harris, “Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as ‘Locus Sanctissimus’ in the Eleventh Century,” 143.

⁸ In Luke 6:43–48, Jesus tells the parable of the fruit-bearing tree (namely, that one knows the tree by its fruit). Bede compares the tree to a man who builds a house. The house demonstrates the skill and the wisdom of the builder. The trees are understood as people, the *Templum Dei*, who are built up on the rock of Christ. For a discussion of this parable within Cluniac liturgy, see *Ibid.*, 144–146.

enmeshed in earthly citizenship. Thus, both groups of monks sang common songs that placed the singers in some sort of spatial relationship with the God as the object of their worship and with the two “Jeruselems” of earth and heaven as the sites of their praise. The monks of Cluny regarded the city, the “place,” as primary, however, so they sought to recreate that sacred space within which they might dwell. The Cistercian monks, on the other hand, regarded the communal choir as primary, so they focused their attention upon the creation of a sacred community first, and thereafter they built a “city” around themselves. Therefore, the interpretations of the spatial metaphors contained within these shared liturgical songs were not only exegetically and imaginatively different from each other, but functionally different as well. In this way, the interpretation of space within the source text differed as a product of context, and this difference yielded dissimilar engagements with the holy words as a result.

SPATIAL EXEGESIS AS A MEANS OF SACRED SPACE CONSTRUCTION

The opening line of *Urbs beata Ierusalem*, “blessed city of Jerusalem, called a vision of peace, built in heaven from living stones, and crowned by the angels as a bride rejoicing,” strongly recalls the themes shown to be so important to Bernard. Jerusalem, the “vision of peace,” drew men like Philip to undertake monastic vows, and it was thus built up by “living stones” to become “just like a bride well adorned for her husband, [Christ],” to borrow the relevant phrase from Revelation 21:1. Bernard was a powerfully influential figure during the twelfth century, but he was not the only Cistercian exegete of note. In this chapter, I examine the construction and the discussion of the Cistercian monastery as a sacred space within the exegetical thought of two additional Cistercian preachers, theologians, and exegetes: Aelred of Rievaulx and Helinand of Froidmont. In both cases, I consider ways in which these interpreters

adapted ideas of space and of spatial relations developed within their source texts as a means of relating their community to Christian salvation history.

Aelred of Rievaulx, who has been called the “Bernard of the North,”⁹ explored a biblically-inspired contrast between “mud bricks” and “living stones” as a means of identifying the members of the Christian Church as those who have superseded Jews in their right to inherit Jerusalem. Moreover, he used the paradigm of “living stones” to describe his monks as the truest element of the Church of Peter, pronouncing them “living stones built up [into] a spiritual house, a holy priesthood” who dwell within the Temple of Jerusalem, closest to God and nearest to ascension. Using biblical passages and Cistercian liturgical practice as his guides, Aelred created a spiritualized, exegetical topography of “Jerusalem,” within which he set various Christian and non-Christian communities into different regions and courts of concentric, increasing holiness depending upon their nearness to the Holy of Holies, the irruption point of theophany where humankind may cross the sacred bridge and ascend into God.

In a sermon preached on the Assumption of Mary, Helinand of Froidmont reaffirmed the Cistercian project of the “heavenly Jerusalem,” but he also developed and transformed elements of this exegetical ideal in order to respond to a changing theological and political landscape. In order to remain relevant to a changing world of rising scholasticism and mendicant movements, the Cistercians were forced to leave their deserts in seeming opposition both to the *Rule of Benedict* and to the early statutes of the Order. Helinand began to counter this potentially disastrous break from tradition by seeking to internalize Cistercian traditions of sacred space construction and thereby to create a ritual space within the souls of the brethren. Drawing likewise upon the biblical precedents of “living stones built up [into] a spiritual house,” Helinand encouraged his monastic audience to construct the eschatological Temple within themselves,

⁹ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 39.

becoming “living stones” built upon “Christ’s cornerstone” so that they may spiritually dwell within the sacred community, wherever they might find themselves physically.

AELRED OF RIEVAULX AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF “MUD BRICKS” INTO “LIVING STONES”

Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–1167) is perhaps best known for the *Speculum caritatis* (*The Mirror of Charity*), which he wrote around 1142, supposedly at Bernard of Clairvaux’s request.

Born in Northumbria and educated in the court of King David I of Scotland, Aelred joined the Cistercian community at Rievaulx (Yorkshire, England) in 1134, two years after the monastery was founded. He served as abbot of the monastery from 1147 until his death in 1167.¹⁰

Cistercian monasticism on the British Isles expanded rapidly, for the early recruitment successes of Waverly (founded in 1129), Rievaulx (founded 1132), and Fountains (founded 1135) created, according to Lekai, “nationwide publicity on behalf of Cistercians” such that “for the subsequent twenty years the greatest families in the country vied with one another for the favor of having the white monks settled on their estates.”¹¹

Aelred was a particular gem in the crown of the Cistercian Order in England. As Lekai observes, his “youthful charms, eminent talents and precocious erudition opened up the highest positions in Church and government to him, but a chance visit at the newly founded Rievaulx made him a prisoner of Cistercian ideals forever.”¹² In fact, Lekai considers Aelred “one of the most appealing characters of monastic history,” who “could not match Saint Bernard’s stature as a statesman and reformer, but was his equal in compassionate love and understanding for men of all walks of life.”¹³ Set alongside Bernard of Clairvaux and William of Saint Thierry, Lekai

¹⁰ Ibid., 232.

¹¹ Ibid., 38.

¹² Ibid., 39.

¹³ Ibid.

refers to Aelred as the “third great luminary of twelfth-century Cistercian monasticism.”¹⁴

Aelred’s force of presence is both historically observable—for he filled his abbey with monks and lay-brothers, up to 650 people according to his contemporary biographer¹⁵—and palpable in his writings, which range in several edited volumes within the *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* (CCCM) series from personal communications to treatises to a substantial collection of sermons preached to monks, lay brothers, and secular audiences in and around Rievaulx.¹⁶ By the time of Aelred’s death, Rievaulx had risen in prominence and had added an additional five foundations to the Cistercian Order (Fountains had added eight), and these foundations continued to expand throughout Scotland and Wales.¹⁷

While discussing Bernard’s *Sermons on the Ascension*, I explored the relationship between the procession that Bernard instituted for that liturgical feast and the procession that he

¹⁴ Elsewhere Lekai expands on his opinion of Aelred in relation to Bernard when he writes: “Aelred entered Rievaulx in 1134 as a young man of twenty-four, and soon rose in England to almost the same stature as Bernard had attained in France; in fact, his contemporaries often referred to him as ‘the Bernard of the North.’ A spiritual director of magnetic personality, Aelred came close indeed to the Abbot of Clairvaux, although as a thinker and author he was less creative”; Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 232.

¹⁵ Ibid., 39.

¹⁶ Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera omnia*, ed. Anselm Hoste, C. H. Talbot, and Gaetano Raciti, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 1, 2A–2D (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971). Aelred’s major writings include, according to Lekai, “a dialogue on the subject [of the soul], entitled *De anima*, which closely followed Augustine. His best-known work, another dialogue *On Spiritual Friendship*, treated, under the inspiration of Cicero, a subject closest to his heart. Aelred’s booklet on *Jesus at the Age of Twelve* and his *Prayers* of charming piety and simplicity were his contributions to devotional literature. In addition to several sermon collections, he wrote hagiographical works and even an historical work of considerable importance, the *Genealogy of the Kings of England*. Unfortunately, only a small fraction of his extensive correspondence has survived”; Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 232.

¹⁷ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 40. Janet Burton, who surveys the early development of Rievaulx, argues that Aelred’s fundraising efforts and his influence over local and regional nobility caused “Rievaulx [to leapfrog] from intensely local patronage to high level connections with Durham and Scotland, and these were decisive factors in its development”; Janet Burton, “Rievaulx Abbey: The Early Years,” in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honor of Peter Fergusson*, ed. Terry N. Kinder and Peter Fergusson, *Medieval Church Studies* 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 47–53, here 53. She does not consider this push towards growth in light of Cistercian ideas of poverty and austerity, however.

envisioned that conducted Christ to the right hand of God the Father. With Aelred, I would like to discuss another “peak moment of the liturgical year,” to borrow Waddell’s phrase, as I would like to consider Aelred’s Palm Sunday preaching and its associated procession.¹⁸ According to Waddell, preaching on important liturgical occasions was conducted under the assumption of liturgical unity; that is say, using Waddell’s apt example, “when Bernard preached about the Palm Sunday procession, it was not just about the procession of Jesus into Jerusalem... it was also about the final procession of the faithful into the glory of the eschatological kingdom.”¹⁹

PREACHING ON PALM SUNDAY, JEWS AS “BRICKS” AND CHRISTIAN “STONES”

In the presence of assumed liturgical unity, and *cyclicity*, from Christ’s birth to Christ’s death and from creation to eschaton, Beverly Kienzle observes that Palm Sunday tended to involve preaching on the cross, which included “the ritual veneration of the cross and the liturgical reproaches with their clear anti-Jewish message.”²⁰ In his First Sermon on Palm Sunday (*In Ramis Palmarum* I), Aelred establishes a strong distinction between “mud bricks,” a term which he links to the Jews, and “living stones,” an image which he employs to describe Christians. The exegetical precedent for this dichotomy began in St Paul’s Letter to the Galatians (4:21–5:1). Here Paul created an allegory relating Abraham’s two wives—the slave woman Hagar and the free woman Sarah—to two “Jerusalems.” Hagar, the “Jerusalem of Mount Sinai in Arabia,” represents the matron of the “enslaved” and the city of the Jews; Sarah, the

¹⁸ Waddell, “The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Cistercian Preaching,” 335. Cassidy-Welch describes the liturgical and processional activity of the Palm Sunday events within the cloister in *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries*, 59–65.

¹⁹ Waddell, “The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Cistercian Preaching,” 348. As Waddell explains elsewhere, “liturgy and Scripture were essentially two modes of presence of the same essential reality”; see, *Ibid.*, 349.

²⁰ Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “Preaching the Cross: Liturgy and Crusade Propaganda,” *Medieval Sermon Studies* 53, no. 1 (2009): 13.

“Jerusalem up above,” represents the matron of the “free” and the city of the Church of Christ. The Church, Paul claimed, is the true Isaac, the firstborn “child of promise,” who has superseded and triumphed over his slaveborn Jewish sibling (vv. 28–31). Christian triumphalism recurs within tradition throughout the history of the Church, and sermons delivered on Palm Sunday represent one especially common liturgical occasion for supersessionist rhetoric in the Middle Ages.²¹

Speaking to the assembled brethren (likely both regular and lay), Aelred of Rievaulx preached Jesus’ entry into the earthy Jerusalem as a prelude for Jesus’ (and his Church’s) ultimate entry into the heavenly Jerusalem on the Day of Judgment.²² Using Ephesians and 1 Peter as guiding texts for the interpretation of Galatians, Aelred described the “heavenly Jerusalem” as one built of living stones (*de lapidibus vivis*) with Jesus as the corner stone, and thus he proclaimed: “Jerusalem was build up from living stones, squarely-hewn stones, who, adhering to that most solid stone—Christ—who had been set as the corner stone, also took the name (Christians) from him.”²³ In the same way that Paul constructed an allegorical binary between the “earthly” and the “heavenly”—that is, between the Jew and the Christian—Aelred presented his sermon in a series of binaries, ultimately returning to explore the idea of “mud bricks” and “(living) stones”: *lateres ... lutei et terreni* and *lapides (vivi)*.

Aelred begins his interpretive “procession” by wondering how the Jews, as a collective people, could possibly have proclaimed Jesus victorious with palms and praise during his

²¹ All four canonical Gospels relate a version of Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem; cf. Mark 11:1–11; Matthew 21:1–11; Luke 19:28–40; John 12:12–19.

²² See, Sermon 10.13, 15, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 84.

²³ “Aedificatur Ierusalem de lapidibus vivis, lapidibus quadris, qui adhaerentes illi solidissimo lapidi Christo, qui factus est in caput anguli, etiam ab illo nomen accipiunt” (Sermon 10.21, *Ibid.*, 2A: 86.).

triumphal entry into Jerusalem only to demand his condemnation a short while later.²⁴ He concludes that, “[It was] the same people (*gens*), [but] not the same men. For there were some Jews who received the Lord with such great honor, and there were other Jews who afflicted him with such great abuse.”²⁵ Observing two kinds of Jewish “people,” (*gens*) Aelred follows Paul’s allegory of one national father, Abraham, having two wives and two sons in order to construct three sets of binaries. First, he considers Jeremiah’s prophecy of “good figs” and “bad figs” (Jeremiah 24:3).²⁶ Next, he speaks about Israel’s crossing of the river Jordan with the Ark in Joshua 3, and he describes two kinds of “water,” “upper” fresh water representing the citizens of the “heavenly Jerusalem up above” and “lower” sea water representing the scribes and the Pharisees.²⁷ Finally, he returns to Jerusalem in order to discuss the construction of its buildings from bricks and stones.

²⁴ “Look first, brother, for two things seem to be pointed out to us this day about our Lord, Jesus Christ; namely, the greatest Glory which the Jewish people showed to him in this world and the greatest contempt which the same people inflicted upon him” (Primum autem videte, fratres, quia duo quaedam nobis hodie de Domino nostro Iesu Christo commendantur, illa scilicet Gloria maxima quam ei gens Iudaeorum in hoc mundo exhibuit, et illa maxima contumelia quam illi eadem gens irrogavit) (Sermon 10.1, Ibid., 81.).

²⁵ “Eadem gens, dixi, non iidem homines. Nam Iudaei fuerunt illi qui Dominum cum tanto honore susceperunt, et Iudaei fuerunt illi qui eum tanta contumelia affecerunt. Sed tamen alii isti, alii illi” (Sermon 10.3, Ibid.).

²⁶ Aelred identifies the *figus bonas* with the body of Christ, the Church (*id est corpori suo, sanctae videlicet Ecclesiae suae uniret*), and the *figus malas* with the “spiny” Jews (following Isaiah 5:4) because “they [drew] the blood of that most holy body.” The first group sang the Palm Sunday blessing, “*Hosanna Filio David, Hosanna in excelsis*,” whereas the second group shouted, “*Crucifige, crucifige eum*” (see Sermon 10.3–6, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 81–82.).

²⁷ While describing the second pair of opposing forces, Aelred observes that “as soon as the Ark of the Lord entered the waters, those very waters were divided and that part which was higher up (*superior*) stood up in the likeness of a wall and that part which was lower (*inferior*) flowed into the sea” (Sermon 10.7, Ibid., 2A: 82.). Aelred ultimately concludes that the waters that “stood up like a wall” were superior because, following Paul in Galatians 4, “[these] pertain to the Jerusalem which is up-above, which is free, which is our mother.” These waters are likened to those who waived the palm branches and, because they proclaimed the resurrection, they will receive resurrection at the Last Judgment. The waters that “flowed out into the sea,” however, are the scribes and the Pharisees who are “bitter like the sea water.” These tried to impress

As an exegetical bridge between the waters and the stones, Aelred quotes Luke 19:40, “truly I tell you, if they should stay silent, then the stones shall cry out,” (*Amen dico nobis quia, si isti tacuerint, lapides clamabunt*) to describe the inevitable failure of the “bitter” Pharisees. Citing Isaiah 9:10 to interpret Luke 19:40, he describes the silent, wicked Jews as bricks (*lateres*) fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah that “the bricks have fallen down, but we are building up with square-cut stones, (*lateres ceciderunt, sed quadris lapidibus aedificabamus*).”²⁸ Although the bitter Jews stay silent, the stones (*lapides*)—namely, the Christians—“cry out,” leading Aelred to consider further the contrast between *lateres* and *lapides*. Indeed, according to Aelred, the *lateres* in Isaiah *must* be none other than the Jews, “muddy and terrestrial,” “*lutei et terreni*,” who fell away “from that holy edifice of the patriarchs and the prophets.”²⁹ These “bricks” are ruined. God, however, promises a better city that will be constructed “out of living stones,” “*de lapidibus vivis*.” This city is the Church of Christ, the heavenly city of Jerusalem.

When Aelred described the Jews as “muddy” and “terrestrial” in this Palm Sunday sermon, he was using terms that resonate across his theological works and sermons. In *Speculum caritatis*, Aelred uses the adjective “*luteus, -a, -um*” to describe distinctly negative attributes of the body, the bodily passions in particular.”³⁰ Further, Aelred maintained the same negative corporeality attributed to the adjective “muddy” in another of his sermons, this one preached on

others with their knowledge of Scripture and they tried to silence the crowds praising Jesus. Yet, they were doomed to failure, because, as Jesus proclaimed: “*Amen dico nobis quia, si isti tacuerint, lapides clamabunt*” (Sermon 10.18–19, *Ibid.*, 2A: 85.).

²⁸ Sermon 10.20, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 85.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ “Aelred writes: “For this body is a certain kind of instrument, which must train itself. It is guilty of a muddy nature, with innumerable passions, that it may not bear the power of a burning spirit unless an exterior act should temper it by some management” (*corpus enim hoc quoddam est instrumentum, quo ipsum exerceri habet, quod cum luteae qualitatis sit, innumerabilibus obnoxium passionibus vim ferventis spiritus ferre non sustinens, nisi quodam moderamine actus exterior temperetur*); *Speculum caritatis* 3.23, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Opera ascetica*.

the Feast of St Benedict (March 21)—the day which also commemorates the foundation of the *novum monasterium* in 1098 and which also happened to be Palm Sunday in 1098.

Preaching on St Benedict's day, Aelred used the term "muddy" in an allegory of Israel's enslavement to Pharaoh in Egypt.³¹ Aelred explains: "the ministers of Pharaoh—namely, unclean spirits—strike at us as if we are reluctant in order that we might create "mud bricks"—namely, unclean and filthy works—and so that we might build up the city of Pharaoh—namely, the Devil—in our heart."³² Emma Cazabonne, while researching the theme of "cities of refuge" in Aelred's sermons, has noted that the Exodus theme is a prevalent motif in the abbot's work. According to her research, Aelred typically related the evil pharaoh to general human wickedness, and he used metaphors of building to describe the cultivation of iniquitous deeds.³³ Thus, speaking to his monastic community on St Benedict's day—the day when Robert and the other first Cistercians ceased their "exodus"—Aelred admonished his monks, who potentially remain under Pharaoh's oppression, to take care and to follow properly the *Rule of St. Benedict* in order to cease their filthy and muddy activities. The image of the wicked Pharaoh demanding bricks appears again in Homily 29 of Aelred's great *Homilies on the Burdens of Isaiah* (*Homiliae de oneribus propheticae Isaiae*).³⁴

³¹ Listed as "Sermon 6" in the *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* edition of Aelred's sermons (*Opera Omnia* 2A, from the collections at Clairvaux).

³² "Et tamen ministri Pharaonis, id est immundi spiritus, nos impingebant quasi invitos ut faceremus lateres luteos, id est immunda et sordida opera, et sic aedificaremus civitatem Pharaoni, id est diabolo, in corde nostro" (Sermon 6.8, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 54.).

³³ Emma Cazabonne, "Aelred of Rievaulx and the 'Cities of Refuge,'" *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2007): 272.

³⁴ For an introduction to this collection of homilies and for a discussion of some of the particular difficulties in interpreting them, see Lewis White, "Bifarie itaque potest legi: Ambivalent Exegesis in Aelred of Rievaulx's *De Oneribus*," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2007): 299–327.

Homily 29 contains Aelred's fullest discussion of the dichotomous pair of *lateres* and *lapides* in the *Homilies on the Burdens of Isaiah*. In this homily, Aelred compares the "bricks" (*lateres*) used to build both the Tower of Babel and the walls of Pharaoh's kingdom to the "stones" (*lapides*) used to build the Temple of Solomon. In these two material elements he identifies the enduring contrast between the teachers and preachers of the Church (*doctores scilicet et pastores Ecclesiae*—the "stones") and the worldly-wise and the heretics, "asserters of perverse teaching" (*sapientes huius saeculi et perversorum dogmatum assertores*—the "bricks").³⁵ "Bricks" are not merely inferior building materials; rather, they represent inferior imitations of the superior "stones." Pharaoh, according to Aelred, enslaved the sons of Israel to build walls of bricks like those used to build up the Tower (of Babel) *in campo Sennaar*. Thus, Aelred observes, "[the Israelites] seek bricks (*lateres*), which are hardened in the fire after having been packed together out of the soft mud. Indeed, these had the likeness of stones, but they were lacking its strength (lit. 'not knowing [its] virtue')." ³⁶ Not merely inferior building materials, therefore, Aelred depicts the *lateres* as inferior and dangerous simulacra of the superior *lapides*. Reading through Isaiah 16, he continues:

Such are the muddy hearts of the carnal ones, which are hardened by the habit of sinning and by an obstinate mind, repelling the pointed arrows with which the soldiers of Christ have been armed for the purpose of putting an end to the city of the Moabites. From these very bricks Pharaoh built a city, and the sons of Israel, whom he shall render into slavery, he forces to exert themselves in mud and chaff. From these very same bricks, the worldly-wise of this age and the assertors of perverse teaching against the Church of Christ erected a wall, creating disciples for themselves who were both obstinately defending error and driving back those things which were logically presented to them.³⁷

³⁵ Homily 29, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Homeliae de oneribus prophetis Isaiae*, ed. Gaetano Raciti, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 2D (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 265.

³⁶ "lateres quaerunt, qui de molli luto compacti in igne durantur, habentes quidem lapidum similitudinem, sed virtutem ignorantes" (Homily 29, in *Ibid.*).

³⁷ "Talia sunt lutea corda carnalium, quae peccandi consuetudine et mentis obstinatione durantur, repellentes sagittas acutas quibus ad debellandas urbes Moabiticis Christi milites armantur. De

The bricks (*lateres*), which “are hardened by the habit of sinning and by an obstinate mind,” represent the perennial enemies of Christ, existing throughout history. These bricks build up an offensive fortification designed to thwart and to hinder the ultimate (and inevitable) victory of the Christians as time proceeds towards the eschaton. First employed by the “sons of Israel” under the direction of Pharaoh (the Devil), these bricks become the repurposed materials with which contemporary enemies of Christ raise walls of errors. Whereas God may have hardened Pharaoh’s heart in the biblical story of Exodus, Aelred insists that his current audience regard Jews and heretics alike as those whose hardened hearts have constructed battlements of war in preparation for the cosmic battle between good and evil.³⁸ Aelred continues this theme in his subsequent homily.

In Homily 30, Aelred again quotes Isaiah 9:10 in order to classify Jews as bricks that have fallen away, as building materials of a lesser quality who are attempting to hide their inferiority through deceit, displaying the outward appearance of piety while failing to understand its true merit:

The “wall of baked bricks” describes the status of the inner human being who is prideful and arrogant, who does not choose the stable foundation having been ‘built from square-cut stones’ (Isaiah 9:10)—that is from virtues (strengths) of Truth—but from the mud of filthy intentions and from falsehoods pretending to be virtues hardened by the fire of carnal desire. He prefers a certain appearance of piety, but remains ignorant of its virtue (strength). The mud is gold, the mud is silver, the mud is the satisfaction of whatever kind of desire, the mud is the value of a person by human reckoning. Thus “muddy” is everything which stirs the

huiusmodi lateribus Pharaon urbes construit, et filios Israel quos in servitutem redegerit, in luto et paleis desudare compellit. De talibus etiam lateribus sapientes huius saeculi et perversorum dogmatum assertores contra Christi Ecclesiam murum erexerunt, creantes sibi discipulos qui et errorem defenderent obstinatius et ea quae obicerentur subtilius propulsarent” (Homily 29, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera omnia*, 2D: 265.).

³⁸ For more on the relationship between Jews and heretics in medieval thought, see Sara G. Lipton, “Jews, Heretics, and the Sign of the Cat in the Bible moralisée,” *Word and Image* 8 (1992): 362–377, esp. her historical overview on p. 362–363.

thoughts around these things, “muddy” is everything which directs concentration towards these things.³⁹

Lateres depict an element of inferior imitation of the superior *lapides*—that is, they are muddy aggregates rather than solid rocks—and they convey the predilection to sin, as it is sin which causes the mud to harden into bricks. Since “mud bricks” are built up into a wall of multiplying errors designed and constructed to obstruct Christian doctrine by the enemies of Christ, it becomes necessary both to be able to distinguish the mud brick from the stone and to defend against the offense.

In both Homily 29 and 30 of the *Burdens of Isaiah* and in the Palm Sunday sermon from above, Aelred identified the cross of Christ as the interpretive key to recognizing mud brick from stone and as the solution against those who “raised walls of bricks against the Church of Christ.”⁴⁰ In both the Palm Sunday sermon and the homilies on Isaiah, Aelred linked “bricks” and “stones” to Jews and heretics and to Christians; that is, to those who refuse the “preaching of Christ crucified” on the one hand and those who “preach Christ crucified” on the other. It is the Cross, according to Aelred, which makes all the difference. Interpreting Simeon’s prophecy in

³⁹ “‘*Murum cocti lateris*’ (Is. 16:11) superborem et arrogantium interioris hominis statum appellat, qui non ex quadris lapidibus, id est veris virtutibus, compactus, stabile fundamentum sortitur, sed ex luto sordidae intentionis, falsis simulatis que virtutibus, cupiditatis igne duratus, praefert quidem speciem pietatis, sed virtutem eius ignorat. Lutum est aurum, lutum est argentum, lutum est cuiuslibet voluptatis expletio, lutum de homine hominis aestimatio. Lutea proinde est omnis quae circa haec versatur cogitatio, lutea omnis quae ad haec tendit intentio” (Homily 30.5, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Homelie de oneribus prophetis Isaiae*, 274.).

⁴⁰ Cf. Homily 29:10–11, “Quoniam et Iudaei signa quaerunt et Graeci sapientiam requirunt, nos autem praedicamus Christum crucifixum, Iudaeis quidem scandalum, gentibus autem stultitiam. Agamus ergo gratias Domino Deo nostro, fratres, qui per verbum crucis, quod pereuntibus stultitia est, stultam fecit sapientiam huius mundi, et omnem doctrinam nequam et argumentorum vim, in qua ipsius erat maxima fortitudo, Christianae fidei simplicitate subvertit” (Ibid., 265); and Sermon 10.24, “Hoc est signum cui totus contradixit mundus, scandalum Iudaeis, stultitia gentibus. Nos, inquit, Apostolus, praedicamus Christum crucifixum, Iudaeis quidem scandalum, gentibus autem stultitiam. Et videte, fratres, quam cito huic signo contradicendum est” (Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 86.).

Luke 2:34 alongside the image of the silent Jews and the speaking stones of Luke 19:40 and the bricks and stones of Isaiah 9:10, Aelred observes:

Christ is adored, he is praised, he is proclaimed. Since, with those “muddy bricks” remaining silent, the “living stones” cried out. For our Jesus has been placed for ruin and for the resurrection of the many, for the ruin of the bricks and for the resurrection of the stones. “And for a sign,” he said, “which will be opposed.”⁴¹

While Jews, as deniers of Christ, were clearly objects of Aelred’s polemic, Christians which The Revelator might call “lukewarm,” or which we might consider philosophically- or scholastically-minded, were likewise Aelred’s concern.⁴² Aelred best expressed this concern of “not-quite-Christian” Christians in his depiction of the city of Jerusalem as both a sacred space and, somewhat paradoxically, as a city of varying layers of sanctity.

AELRED’S “JERUSALEM”: BUILDING A CITY OF “LIVING STONES”

Preaching on the Assumption of Mary (*In assumptione sanctae Mariae*), Aelred proclaimed: “Maria is finely formed, just like Jerusalem, [because] she is not comparable to any

⁴¹ Cf. Luke 2:34, “Then Simeon blessed them, and he said to his mother Mary: ‘See that he has been set for the ruin and for the resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign which will be opposed’” (Et benedixit illis Simeon, et dixit ad Mariam matrem ejus: Ecce positus est hic in ruinam, et in resurrectionem multorum in Israel, et in signum cui contradicetur). Aelred interprets this as: “Adoratur Christus, laudatur, clamatur, quia, illis luteis lateribus tacentibus, vivi lapides clamant. Positus est ergo Iesus noster in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum, in ruinam laterum, in resurrectionem lapidum. Et in signum, inquit, cui contradicetur” (Sermon 10.23, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 86.).

⁴² John Sommerfeldt has discussed Aelred’s curious relationship to Jews at some length. He argues that, when Aelred writes harshly against Jews, he writes against their prior and their present rejection of Jesus. Their present rejection aligns them with heretics. At the eschaton, however, some Jews will be gathered together with the blessed Christians and, so, Aelred remains somewhat ambivalent in his presentation of the “Jew” within his work. See, John R. Sommerfeldt, *Aelred of Rievaulx on Love and Order in the World and the Church* (Paulist Press, 2006), 161–178.

particular stone in that city, but she is comparable to the whole city.”⁴³ “Of this Jerusalem,” Aelred explained, “one part is on earth, which is constructed from ‘living stones’: this part is the holy Church and all of the saints who are in it just as if they are its stones.”⁴⁴ He then identifies these “stones” using various gems to indicate various virtues, but Aelred’s basic idea remains similar to that which we saw in Bernard. In particular, Aelred highlights the same categories that Bernard used when he qualified the “Church” to his brethren as “martyrs, confessors, monks, hermits, and virgins.” I suspect that this qualification made by both preachers is meant to highlight their Cistercian monks as a subset of the Church best understood as “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God” following Ephesians 2:19.

In a sermon on All Saint’s Day (*In festivitate omnium sanctorum*), Aelred again praises the Church and once more pointedly marks out the Church as martyrs, confessors, monks, hermits, and virgins.⁴⁵ Next he proclaims: “O how blessed is Mother Church, which divine honor thus sets alight!”⁴⁶ She is our mother, the heavenly Jerusalem (cf. Gal. 4:26), the Holy Land, the Land of the Living (*terra viventium*, cf. *lapides vivi*), many kinds of merits are

⁴³ “Videte modo magnam dignitatem beatae Mariae: formosa est sicut Ierusalem. Non comparatur alicui uni lapidum in illa ciuitate, sed toti ciuitati comparator” (Sermon 45.35, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 362.).

⁴⁴ “Huius Ierusalem una pars in terra est, quae construitur de uiuis lapidibus: ipsa est sancta Ecclesia, et omnes sancti qui in ipsa sunt quasi lapides eius sunt” (Sermon 45.35, in *Ibid.*).

⁴⁵ “Quam gloriosa est ibi uita apostolorum, qui tot turbas quae per eorum doctrinam saluantur, Domino repraesentant! Qualis ibi splendor martyrum, qui uulnera sua uictoriosissimo Domino praetendunt! Qualiter ibi confessores, monachi, heremitae, qui per uigilias, labores et abstinenciam diabolum uicerunt et propriam carnem domauerunt! Quid de uirginibus dicam, quae sequuntur Agnum quocumque ierit, quae illud nouum canticum cantant quod nemo potest dicere, nisi illi qui nulla sunt turpitudine carnis inquinati?” (Sermon 180.5, in *Ibid.*, 2C: 617.).

⁴⁶ Following the well-known liturgical passage from Isaiah 60:1, “Surge, illuminare Ierusalem,” a number of Cistercian monks make various connections between the light in Isaiah and Jesus as the “light of the world” from the Gospel of John. Aelred, for example, preached that “[The Church] is this Jerusalem which Lord Jesus, who is the true and greatest peace, built from living stones (*uiuis lapidibus*), which exerted itself towards his vision... not that this is new to us,” (Haec est Ierusalem quam Dominus Iesus, qui pax uera et summa est, aedificat de uiuis lapidibus, quae ad eius uisionem tendit... Non est hoc nouum uobis) (Sermon 4.6, in *Ibid.*, 2A: 38.).

permitted and yet there is one peace and one union, a common joy.”⁴⁷ Immediately thereafter, Aelred locates his brethren, his “Church,” into what may be perhaps the most perfectly captured expression of monastic liminality, centuries before theorists such as Victor Turner. Aelred states:

Between these two lands—one of the dead and the other of the living—there is a middle land, “of the dying.” This is the one in which we find ourselves. Here there are none save the dying. The dying are those who are neither fully alive nor fully dead. The ones fully dead are those who are in the Land of the Dead. The ones fully alive are those who are in the Land of the Living. We are between both of these. It is necessary, therefore, that we ourselves pay careful attention to them so that we might avoid the fullness of death in order that we might come to the fullness of life. This we must do here.⁴⁸

Aelred’s words are both troubling and insightful. Although it is not hopeless, Aelred’s presentation of the communal life as one held in common with all of creation in the “world of the dying” is certainly not cheerful. Yet, just as monks are wont to be described and to describe themselves as “dead to the world,” Aelred’s exhortation that his brethren pursue the path towards the Land of the Living, while they persist in a state of being neither alive nor dead, captures the same kind of ambivalence expressed by Bernard when he questioned his own viability and that of his monks to join within the liturgical celebrations celebrating the life of Christ and of his Apostles, who themselves could not yet share in Christ’s glory despite their proximity to God.

When Aelred distinguishes “mud bricks,” as those who remain mired in terrestrial earthliness, from “living stones,” as those who serve as the building material for the heavenly

⁴⁷ “O quam beata mater Ecclesia, quam sic honor diuinus illuminat! Ipsa est mater nostra, Ierusalem caelestis, terra sancta, terra uiuentium, ubi licet diuersa sint merita, una tamen est pax et una concordia, communis laetitia” (Sermon 180.6, in *Ibid.*, 2C: 617.).

⁴⁸ “Inter istas duas terras, una mortuorum, altera uiuentium, media est terra morientium. Ipsa est in qua nos sumus. Hic non sunt nisi morientes. Morientes sunt qui nec plane uiuunt nec plane mortui sunt. Ipsi plane mortui sunt, qui sunt in terra mortuorum. Illi plane uiuunt, qui sunt in terra uiuentium. Nos sumus inter utrumque. Necesse igitur est ut ita circumspeciamus nosmet ipsos, ut perfectam mortem uitemus et ad perfectam uitam ueniamus. Hoc debemus hic agere” (Sermon 180.7, in *Ibid.*).

Jerusalem, his comparison mirrors Bernard's opening meditation in his Third Sermon on the Ascension when Bernard wondered about the possibility for fallen human beings, even spiritually-minded monks, to rise above the constraints of their earthly vessel.⁴⁹ Bernard observed that the saints up above engage in Christ's word (*sermo*) more fully than he and his brethren below because the glorified bodies of the saints are spiritual and, therefore, superior to the earthly bodies of his present audience, who muddy their senses with physicality. Bernard preached hope through the advent of the Paraclete, who descends from God as Christ ascends in order to maintain the divine bridge between our two worlds. Aelred adopted a similar kind of "Cistercian" theological anthropology that related the possibility of his monks to ascend into God with their identification as "Jerusalemites" within a monastic "Jerusalem" joined to the "Jerusalem up above."

As with Bernard, Aelred's biblically-inspired metaphor of building materials remains squarely and consistently focused upon communities rather than on places. For example, in the Palm Sunday sermon above, "Jerusalem" (the monastery) represents the liturgical site of the procession and "Jerusalem" (the heavenly city) represents the terminal point of the soul's repose. The monks, however, represent the "living stones" or the "superior Jews" or the "Jerusalemites" required for this conceptualization of an exegetical journey.⁵⁰ Likewise, in a sermon preached on

⁴⁹ Bernard began: "Today the Lord of heaven pierced through the heights of heaven with heavenly power, casting off infirm flesh as if a mere cloud, he donned the garb of glory... the Wisdom of God returned to the place of wisdom, where all understand and seek out the good with the most penetrating intellect, the most readied affect in order 'to hear the voice of his words.' But we are in this place, where wickedness is manifest and wisdom is lacking because 'the body which is corrupted burdens the soul, and the earthly container suppresses the mind with many concerns'" (Sermon 3.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 131.). For Kienzle's translation, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 37.

⁵⁰ Helinand, featured below, likewise described the Palm Sunday procession as, according to Mette Birkedal Bruun, the "itinerary towards the celestial Jerusalem." Bruun examines the "communicative exchange between Hélinand's [Palm Sunday] sermon, the liturgical ritual and

the Feast of the Purification (*In purificatione sanctae Mariae*), Aelred encourages his monks to imitate the holy Simeon, a “citizen of Jerusalem” and a man “righteous and fearing the Lord, waiting for the consolation of Israel, in whom was the Holy Spirit.”⁵¹ The prophet Simeon, encountered above, awaited the infant Jesus at the Temple, knowing that his parents would bring him for the rites of purification. Aelred returns to Luke 2 to urge his audience to be like Simeon, anxiously awaiting their Lord:

So great was Saint Simeon, about whom the Evangelist says, ‘there was a man in Jerusalem.’ And we, brothers, if we shall be like such a man, then we shall live fully in Jerusalem. Jerusalem, as you know, is understood as the ‘vision of peace.’ And we, if we shall be like such a man, then we shall see peace and we shall dwell within this vision of peace.⁵²

Aelred explains that one may become as a saint (in this case, like Simeon), if one spurns bodily desires (*corporales uoluptates spreuerimus*) and casts down base passions (*bestialem uitam perfecte abiecerimus*) so that, “just as human beings should, we shall devote all care to our souls, so that all of these battles of our members might cease and sins might cease to fight against us, and we shall live in peace upon the earth.”⁵³ The point that Aelred makes here, which reflects the point that he made above in the *Mirror of Charity*, is that the practice of spiritual control, which is taught within the monastic *scola*, both subjugates the body and properly aligns the spirit as master of the flesh. As a result of this act of corporeal subjugation, Aelred promises

its architectural setting” in Mette Birkedal Bruun, “Mapping the Monastery: Hélinand of Froidmont’s Second Sermon for Palm Sunday,” in *Prédication et liturgie au Moyen Âge*, ed. Nicole Bériou and Franco Morenzoni (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 183–199, here 183, 191.

⁵¹ “et ecce homo erat in Hierusalem cui nomen Symeon et homo iste iustus et timoratus expectans consolationem Israhel et Spiritus Sanctus erat in eo” (Luke 2:25).

⁵² “Talis erat sanctus Simeon, de quo dicit euangelista: Erat homo in Ierusalem. Et nos, fratres, si tales fuerimus, plane in Ierusalem habitabimus. Ierusalem, sicut scitis, uisio pacis interpretatur. Et nos, si tales fuerimus, uidebimus pacem et in ista uisione pacis habitabimus” (Sermon 34.10, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 281.).

⁵³ “Si enim corporales uoluptates spreuerimus et bestialem uitam perfecte abiecerimus et, sicut homines debent, omnem curam nostram animae nostrae impenderimus, conquiescent omnes illae pugnae membrorum nostrorum et desinent ipsa uitia pugnare contra nos et habitabimus in pace super terram” (Sermon 34.11, in *Ibid.*).

his monks that they might look to Simeon and “see in ourselves this peace, so that it is possible for us also to say that we live in Jerusalem, the is ‘the vision of peace.’”⁵⁴

Simeon was a Jerusalemite, as the Gospel tells us, but Aelred treats his citizenship as that of the heavenly city, rather than of the earthly city. To be like Simeon—that is, a saintly citizen of the heavenly Jerusalem—Aelred prescribed a program for his community that relied upon an anthropology of two bodies. On the one hand, he told each individual monk that they must subdue the warring factions within their various members in order to make the physical vessel subservient to the spiritual core. On the other hand, Aelred used the plural vocative address (*fratres*) and first personal plural verb choices to impress upon his audience that the community of monks itself represents a corporate body which must act in obedience and in accordance with its proper manner of life (*conversatio*) in order to remain stably living in its “Jerusalem,” its “vision of peace.” That Aelred, and Bernard treated the monks as a corporate body of individual members is hardly unique. Indeed, a vast majority of the contributors to western Christian tradition have described the Church most broadly as the “members” of Christ’s body. It seems clear, however, that both Bernard and Aelred envisioned their Cistercian community distinctively as well as corporately, so their words are perhaps best understood as being directed to a body within a body.⁵⁵

Beginning with Paul’s allegory in Galatians 4, theologians had precedent to identify the Church both as a corporate body—for example, as Sarah or Isaac—and as (the heavenly)

⁵⁴ “Sic uideamus in nobis hanc pacem, ut possit etiam de nobis dici quod habitemus in Ierusalem, id est in uisione pacis” (Sermon 34.12, in *Ibid.*).

⁵⁵ Beverly Kienzle has noted that “exegesis of the bride’s body in the Song of Songs envisioned groups within the monastery and various parts of the Church, all united by charity. This close identification of monastery, Church, and heavenly Jerusalem placed any who resisted or differed with monastic values in a state of profound separation and rejection”; Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 60. The abbot, as the head of the monastic body, bore especial responsibility to Christ for his various members; *Ibid.*, 61. See also Newman’s discussion of the monastic “body” in Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 107, 242.

“Jerusalem.” Thus, in another of Aelred’s sermons, this one preached *ad abbates* (“to the abbots”), Aelred revisited the well-known and ancient identification of the Church with “Jerusalem,” but he did so in order to identify monks specifically as “mighty men of Jerusalem.” In other words, while discussing the profane world at large, Aelred treated monks as “Jerusalemites”; however, when relating monks to the other members (citizens) of the Church (Jerusalem), he described them as “superior Jerusalemites” (cf. the Palm Sunday Jews from above). Using 2 Samuel 20 (esp. v. 7) as a guide, Aelred explained to the gathered leaders:

The mighty men of Jerusalem, the city of God, are the patriarchs, the apostles, the martyrs and confessors, holy virgins and hermits, and *monks*, all of whom go out with Abishai—that is, Christ—imitating the obedience of Christ, the humility, patience, gentleness, steadfastness, and goodness of Christ. These are the weapons of the mighty ones who are leaving Jerusalem with Abishai.⁵⁶

Two things are worthy of note in Aelred’s interpretation of this passage from 2 Samuel, in which Abishai marches out against the rebellious Sheba (son of Bikri, a Benjaminite). First, Aelred’s list of “mighty men” recounts the more specific composition of the “Church” discussed above, which included patriarchs, apostles, martyrs and confessors (all of whom being members of the blessed deceased) and holy virgins, hermits, and monks (all of whom being cloistered or shut off in some way from the rest of the world). Put another way, Aelred’s list of the “mighty men of Jerusalem” both corresponds to his consistently narrowed depiction of *Ecclesia* and, therefore, it again corresponds to Bernard’s depiction of the “citizens among the saints, and members of the household of God.” Moreover, Aelred’s presentation of his monks as a spiritual force of discipline, correcting wayward members of the Church body, parallels his call for the

⁵⁶ [Emphasis mine.] “Robusti de Ierusalem, ciuitate Dei, sunt patriarchae, apostoli, martyres et confessores, sacrae uirgines et eremitae et *monachi*, qui omnes egrediuntur cum Abisai, id est Christo, imitantes oboedientiam Christi, humilitatem, patientiam, mansuetudinem, constantiam et benignitatem Christ. Haec sunt arma robustorum egredientium de Ierusalem cum Abisai” (Sermon 143.18, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2C: 381.).

monks to engage in the spiritual discipline of the monastic *conversatio* in order to subjugate the flesh to the spirit.

Second, the “mighty men of Jerusalem” depart the city, along with Christ, in order to wage war against other “members” of the Church who have rebelled (the so-called forces of Sheba). Reminiscent of Bernard’s *Parables* and of the Pharaoh-allegories from Aelred’s own *Homilies on the Burdens of Isaiah*, Aelred describes the rebellious “Jerusalemites” as “tepid” (*tepidi*) and “fearful” (*pavidi*), “soft” (*molles*) and “effeminate” (*effeminati*). He charges: “these ones do not go out with Abishai, chief of the army of David. Rather, falling away from the King, they follow after Sheba, that is, the Devil, so that they find themselves enclosed with him in the city of damnation and the prison of death.”⁵⁷ Bernard described God’s great warrior-virtues as those who departed from their home in the castle of Wisdom in order to fight back against the forces of Pharaoh (the Devil), and Aelred joins his monks both with saintly predecessors (patriarchs, apostles, martyrs and confessors) and with contemporary pursuers of the “heavenly Jerusalem” (holy virgins, hermits) as those who wage spiritual warfare against rebellious forces encroaching against their holy abode. The wayward prince of Bernard’s parables represented the fallen human set adrift and lost within creation until God’s intervention brought him back into the (monastic) city. Aelred’s exegesis on the “mighty men of Jerusalem” instead presents a later division within creation (specifically within the Church) as a narrative of two cities, much like Augustine’s *City of God*.⁵⁸ Fulfilling the martial role of Bernard’s “virtues,” the “mighty men of

⁵⁷ “Isti non egrediuntur cum Abisai, principe militiae Daudi, sed recedentes a rege sequuntur Sibam, id est diabolum, ut cum eo in ciuitate damnationis et carcere mortis concludantur” (Sermon 143.19, Ibid.).

⁵⁸ The image of two rival camps or of two cities, usually Jerusalem and Babylon, is a narrative staple within both Jewish and Christian tradition, and Bernard understandably featured the binary cities in his parables. Aelred also explored the opposing cities in his *Homilies on the Burdens of Isaiah* (*Homiliae de oneribus prophetis Isaiae*). For example, in Homily 19, Aelred contrasts the “city of confusion, that is Babylon with its chief, the Devil” with the “city of peace, that is,

Jerusalem” find themselves as the vanguard on one side of a cosmic civil war. Against these stony, cloistered knights stand sinful Christians who have neglected spiritual hardiness in favor of the muddled mollities of sullied passions.

Aelred returned to the traditionally significant distinction between the cities of Babylon and Jerusalem in another of his sermons, this one preached *In nativitate sanctae Mariae* (On the Nativity of Saint Mary). While maintaining the oft-cited binary between Babylon and Jerusalem, this sermon establishes spatial and topographic vectors similar to those mapped by Bernard in his *Sermons on the Ascension*. Aelred exhorts his monks:

Just as ‘descension’ is understood as that emigration which is made from Jerusalem into Babylon, thus we must understand ‘ascension’ as that emigration which we ought to make from Babylon toward Jerusalem. This is the completion of our way of life (*conversatio*), namely, that we should leave behind Babylon completely. Babylon is interpreted, ‘confusion.’⁵⁹

The experience of descent to which Aelred is referring in this sermon describes both the “Fall” of humankind from God’s grace and the failure of “Christians” to follow Christ. Aelred describes this “Fall” as an act of “*transmigratio*,” that is, the process of moving from one country into another. Elsewhere in this sermon, he observes that “all of the sons of Israel who were in

Jerusalem, with its chief, Christ” (*ciuitas confusionis, id est Babylon, cum principe suo, diabolo, aeternis poenis oneranda in infernum demergetur, et ciuitas pacis, id est Ierusalem, cum suo principe, Christo*) (Homily 19.30, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera omnia*, 2D: 269.).

⁵⁹ “Sicut autem in descensione intelligitur illa transmigratio quae facta est de Ierusalem in Babylonem, ita in ascensione debemus intelligere illam transmigrationem quam facere debemus de Babylonia uersus Ierusalem. Haec est perfectio conuersionis nostrae, ut Babyloniā perfecte relinquamus. Babylon interpretatur confusio” (Sermon 24:34, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*, 2A: 199.). See just above for Aelred’s contrast between the *civitas confusio* and the *civitas pacis*. Bernard upholds a similar contrast between the two cities in one of his sermons on the dedication of a church; he writes: “It is that [peace] which makes brothers live in unity in one way of life (*conversatio*), building a new city for our king, himself a peacemaker, which is also called Jerusalem and which is the vision of peace. Because were a headless multitude is congregated without a treaty of peace, without observation of the law, without discipline and control, it is called not a people but a rabble: it is not a society but a confusion; it exhibits only Babylon, of Jerusalem it has nothing” (Sermon 5, in *Sermones in dedicatione ecclesiae*, translated and discussed in Bruun, *Parables*, 62.).

Jerusalem have been led captive into Babylon.”⁶⁰ The act of ascent, then, describes another act of “transmigration,” although this double act of emigration and immigration represents a return to a former, superior state, a “going up” into Jerusalem and the fulfillment of the monastic *conversatio*.

Aelred’s sermons and homilies make clear that the abbot accepted the idea of the “heavenly Jerusalem” as a descriptor for a holy community on earth. He identifies this holy community as the Church (*Ecclesia*), but he also applies certain qualifications in common with Bernard in order to narrow the broad term “Church” to specific liminal groups, such as monks, hermits, and holy virgins. Still, although Aelred privileges the monastic community as a faction of the “mighty men of Jerusalem,” he does not deny that the Church is, indeed, Jerusalem. When Aelred constructs his exegetical model of Jerusalem, he is unambiguous in his use of categories for the separation of the sacred and the profane: Aelred’s presentation of “mud bricks” vis-à-vis “living stones” is clearly hierarchical, and these building metaphors distinctly demarcate boundaries between terrestrial and spiritual realms. Therefore, the “Church” as the “heavenly Jerusalem” comprised of “living stones” in Aelred’s general exegetical corpus of thought is, like the “heavenly Jerusalem” for Bernard, a stable and identifiable entity that designates a particular class of the Christian spiritual élite. What his sermonic material leaves unanswered, however, is to what extent that group of spiritual élites may be located within a physically defined sacred space such as the Cistercian cloister. Aelred’s discussion of the Temple in his treatise, “On Jesus as a Boy of Twelve”, unmistakably presents the Cistercian cloister as a sacred space rendered sacred by Cistercian “living stones.”

⁶⁰ “Omnes filii Israel qui erant in Ierusalem ducti sunt captiui in Babylonem” (Sermon 24:36, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera omnia*, 2A: 199.).

Aelred wrote “On Jesus as a Boy of Twelve” (*De Iesu puero duodenni*) between 1153 and 1157 for Ivo, a friend of his and a monk of Wardon in Bedfordshire. The short text responds to Ivo’s questions on the spiritual life via a meditation upon the events which transpired during the time when Jesus was brought to the Temple by his parents during Passover, when he eluded them in order to remain at the Temple to teach for three days (Luke 2:41–52).⁶¹ Recounting Jesus’ return to the Temple (some years after his infant encounter with Simeon) as a series of stages, Aelred establishes gradations of sanctity within the city of Jerusalem that terminate at the Temple as the point of maximal holy power. There, Aelred writes using a clever play on words, the “*contemplator* of the most spiritual of spiritual things is found, not in any place inside Jerusalem, but in the Temple.”⁶²

Aelred treats Jesus’ movement from Nazareth to Jerusalem during the festival of Passover as an allegory for Christian supersession. He writes: “it is clear, according to the laws of allegory, that Christ went up from Nazareth to Jerusalem when he left the Synagogue and

⁶¹ For additional background information on this text, see David Knowles, “Introduction,” in Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Works of Aelred of Rievaulx, Volume I: Treatises, The Pastoral Prayer*, trans. Theodore Berkeley, Mary Paul Macpherson, and R. Penelope Lawson, Cistercian Fathers Series 2 (Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1971), xi.

⁶² “Inuenitur itaque spiritalis spiritalium contemplator, non in quolibet loco in Ierusalem, sed in templo”; Aelred of Rievaulx, *De Iesu puero duodenni* 3, in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Opera ascetica*, pars 3, ln. 313. *Contemplator* is derived etymologically from *con* (*cum*), “with”, and *templum*, “place of observation” or “temple,” such that *contemplare* initially referred to the action of augury (bird watching), a special kind of observation conducted at a special kind of place. By Aelred’s time, *contemplator* would be closer in meaning to the modern use of “contemplation,” but Aelred’s statement that that “the *contemplator*... is found nowhere else except the Temple” plays on the ancient meaning of the word even as Aelred uses multiple valences of the term to describe the special holiness of monks as *contemplatores*, “those *within the temple*” and “those *who observe the holy things*.”

manifested himself in his loving kindness to the Church of the Gentiles.”⁶³ Aelred identifies the Temple as the most rightful place for Jesus to be considering his nature. The failure of the Jews—described by the failure of Jesus’ mother, the Synagogue—to find him in his natural place indicates that Jews lack understanding and so have lost divine favor. After considering Luke 2:41–52 using the literal and allegorical senses of scripture, Aelred turns to a tropological, or moral, reading of the passage, and he shifts from intercommunal conflicts between Jews and Christians to consider the intrapersonal struggles of spiritual growth.

Aelred begins discussing the moral meaning behind Jesus’ Temple journey by saying to Ivo, “now I must come back to you, my dearest son, who have resolved to model yourself on Christ and follow closely in Jesus’s footsteps.”⁶⁴ In terms similar to Bernard’s language of spiritual milk and bread in the opening sermon of his *Sermons on the Song of Songs*, Aelred congratulates Ivo that he has made the successful passage from “the poverty of Bethlehem [that is, from the beginning of a good life] to the wealth of Nazareth [that is, to the practice of virtues], and, arriving at the age of twelve, you have gone up from the flowers of Nazareth to the fruits of Jerusalem [that is, to the contemplation of heavenly secrets].”⁶⁵ Progressing on his journey, now Ivo is able to “study the hidden things of the spirit not so much in books as in your own experience.”⁶⁶

Aelred describes the period of the “twelve years,” undertaken both by Christ and by Ivo—his imitator—as “the light of contemplation [which] raises the ardent soul to the heavenly Jerusalem itself, unlocks heaven, opens the gates of paradise, and reveals to the gaze of the pure

⁶³ Aelred of Rievaulx, “Jesus at the Age of Twelve,” in *The Works of Aelred of Rievaulx, Volume I: Treatises, The Pastoral Prayer*, trans. Theodore Berkeley, Cistercian Fathers Series 2 (Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1971), 17.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 25.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

mind the Bridegroom who, looking out as it were through the lattice-work (Song of Songs 2:9), is more comely than the sons of men (Psalm 44:3).⁶⁷ Writing as one monk to another, Aelred depicts the intended practice to be learned by contemplating Jesus' presence in the Temple at twelve years old as the monastic, specifically Cistercian, pursuit of ascent into God. Traveling to Jerusalem indicated Jesus' favor for the "Mother Church," *Ecclesia*, over the fallen matron, *Synagoga*, but Jesus' presence at the Temple specifically teaches a more specialized, and more spiritualized, form of Christian action.⁶⁸ Aelred defines Ivo's (that is, the monk's) imitation of Christ as the fulfillment of the monastic life that "raises the soul in contemplation up to the very gates of the heavenly Jerusalem. ... Then entering Jerusalem, the soul passes 'into the place of the majestic tabernacle, as far as the house of God, with cries of exultation and thanksgiving, (Psalm 41:5).'"⁶⁹ Towards the end of the treatise, as mentioned above, Aelred writes of these ascending monks that the "*contemplator* of the most spiritual of spiritual things is found, not in any place inside Jerusalem, but in the Temple."⁷⁰

Having explained to Ivo that the process of *imitatio Christi* is best reflected by the Cistercian pursuit of ascent into God, Aelred leaves Ivo and Christ at the Temple in order to consider the relationship of the Temple to its municipal surroundings. Aelred observes that Jerusalem has a courtyard, gates, and a Temple, and he writes that these things correspond to three kinds of people. The first, enemies of the Church (such as philosophers and worldly men),

⁶⁷ Ibid., 27.

⁶⁸ Aelred continues this thought, with its ascension-specific monastic connotations: "And thus the soul deserves to hear those sweetest of words: 'You are wholly beautiful, my friend, and there is no spot in you,' (Song of Songs 4:7). For she has been cleansed from the defilement of the passions and has escaped from the snares of busyness. The memory of past things has been banished. The images of outward things have disappeared and with ardent longing she raises the face of her heart in all its beauty to look upon him whom she loves. And therefore she deserves to hear: 'You are wholly beautiful...'" Thereafter he writes to Ivo about the life of solitude among brothers, likening him to the chaste turtledove of the Song; Ibid., 27–28.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 30.

⁷⁰ Cf. Ibid., 36.

are granted access to the courtyard, as they are permitted knowledge of God. The second, friends of the Church and of Christ, are granted access through the gates, as they, “with veil removed and face uncovered, can look upon God’s glory in Sacred Scripture.”⁷¹ The final group, those who are permitted entrance into the Temple, represent those who pursue ascent into God. These people, whose sanctity grants them entry into the most sacred of spaces, are akin to a wholly-burnt and sweet-smelling offering, having access to the sanctuary within which the “fatness of interior love” and the “marrow of affections” becomes a “fragrant smoke mounting up from burning prayers.”⁷²

Aelred’s characterization of the Temple in *De Iesu puero duodenni* as a site of heightened and unique spiritual power draws from a fairly rich vein within Christian tradition extending back to the Gospels and to Paul. In addition to Jesus’ childhood presence at the Temple in Luke, Jesus’ activities around the Temple in all four canonical Gospels, and his words in John (2:19) about raising the fallen temple in three days, alongside the vision of eschatological renewal with its conspicuous absence of a temple in Revelation (cf. 15:5, 21:22) and the idea of the Temple presented in the writings of Paul remain prominent in late antique and medieval exegeses.⁷³ Of these, Thomas Renna argues that St Paul holds the greatest influence over medieval views of the biblical Temple because Paul linked the Temple to the Church in various places (for examples, see 1 Corinthians 3:10–17, 2 Corinthians 6:16–18, Ephesians 2:14–22, and Ephesians 4:11–16). Renna writes that this link created a two-fold prefiguration of the Church: “as the present

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ For a fuller discussion of early biblical antecedents, see Jennifer A. Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” in *Sacrifice in Religious Experience*, ed. Albert I Baumgarten, *Studies in the History of Religions* 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 233–236.

[Church] community and as the glorified Church in heaven.”⁷⁴ Paul’s interpretation may represent the prevailing image during the centuries leading up to the high Middle Ages, but this characterization of the Temple-space as a simple analogue for the Church does not accord as well with figures such as Bernard, who uses the image of the Temple, especially in *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, as way of describing a specific subset of the Church that exists within a communally-constructed sacred space in pursuit of especial holiness.

When Aelred treats the Temple in *De Iesu puero duodenni*, he likewise engages in acts of specificity and of narrowing, which move his conceptualization of the Temple away from “Paul” (following Renna) and closer to Bernard. The Temple, according to Aelred, represents and contains the most spiritually inclined of all citizens of Jerusalem; namely, the Church. Aelred leaves little doubt that he refers to monks engaged in the pursuit of ascent because his ascending hierarchy of outer courts (worldly philosophers), courts inside the gates (members of the Church), and the Temple (spiritual *contemplatores*) both reconstructs his binary of “mud bricks” (Jews, philosophers, fallen Church members, and other “worldly men”) and “living stones” (the true Church built up into a holy Temple following 1 Peter) and recapitulates his consistent presentation of the Church as a “Jerusalem,” which is either broadly or narrowly construed depending upon the context.

Thomas Renna cites the discussion of the Temple in *On Jesus as a Boy of Twelve*, but he presents it as a representation of another kind of spatialized exegesis, that of an internalized and

⁷⁴ Thomas Renna, “Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon,” in *Law, Custom, and the Social Fabric in Medieval Europe: Essays in Honor of Bryce Lyon*, ed. Bernard S. Bachrach and David Nicholas, Studies in Medieval Culture 28 (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1990), 75. Harris argues somewhat differently from Renna insofar as she sees the development of the temple idea in the Christian tradition as literally Pauline although not reflective of Paul’s intended emphasis; she writes that “despite Paul’s insistence [esp. in 1 Cor 3:16 and 1 Cor. 6:19], the somatic temple of every believer was a neglected doctrine for the first millennium of the Christian tradition. In the intervening centuries, the Temple was most often used as a metaphor for the Church, the soul or mind, and heaven”; Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” 235f.

individualized temple-space as a site for spiritual practice. Citing 1 Corinthians 3:16—“Do you not understand that you are God’s temple and that He dwells within you?”—as his foundational text, Renna argues that “from a monastic point of view, ... the biblical Temple held out the greatest possibilities: the Christian as himself a temple.”⁷⁵ While Renna observes that this kind of internalizing exegetical maneuver may be rather prevalent in the mystical or the contemplative literature (and he gives a helpful discussion of this in patristic and early medieval thought within his article),⁷⁶ we have not yet encountered the idea with much frequency in our discussion of the Cistercian exegetical constructions of sacred space. Considering some of Aelred’s contemporaries, Renna notes that the Augustinian Richard of St Victor (d. 1173) “describes the ascent of the contemplative through the antechambers of the Ark in its journey to the holy of holies, where it achieves a foretaste of the heavenly Jerusalem” and that prior Hugo of Fouillooy (d. 1172) “more explicitly integrates the ‘cloister of the soul’ with the Temple in all its dimensions and components.”⁷⁷ This kind of interpretive tradition is instructive, but the nature of the mystical or the contemplative practice creates a certain ephemerality: the idea in practice is not to ground and to stabilize oneself within the Temple but rather to use the layout of the Temple as a guide for the mystical flight of the soul into God. When Aelred describes the function of the Temple for the spiritual practices of Ivo and other members of the Cistercian Order, the Temple serves as a locus of sanctity and as a bridge that joins the life of the monk to the life of Jesus and that links the monastery as the dwelling place of the *contemplatores* to the

⁷⁵ Renna, “Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon,” 76.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 76–79. Renna’s presentation of the patristic and early medieval sources is useful, but I am not entirely convinced. Jean Leclercq and others have argued convincingly that the “internalization” of spiritual practice developed around the eleventh and twelfth centuries alongside other theological reforms (see above). I think that Renna is right to look for precedents within the more mystically inspired texts, but I also think that he might go too far at times with his connections.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 79.

heavenly Temple of perfected contemplation. In other words, Aelred's Temple acts more like an exegetical foundation than as a space for mystical and theoretical *ekstasis*.

CONCLUSION: BUILDING A "TEMPLE" OF "LIVING STONES"

When Renna cites Aelred's *De Iesu puero duodenni* as "an analogy between the three parts of the Temple and the three stages in the soul's progress," he does so in order to claim that Bernard of Clairvaux better understood the entire Christian tradition of Temple exegesis.⁷⁸ Bernard, according to Renna, "without compromising the spiritual interpretation of the Temple as a sign of contemplation, attempts both to combine the dual tradition of the Temple as soul and Church and to show that the earthly Jerusalem must be retained."⁷⁹ For example, while preaching on the dedication of the church at Clairvaux, during which dedication Renna writes that, "it had been common practice since Carolingian times to compare the building to the celestial Jerusalem, on the assumption that the church was a house of God, a place to experience Him, and a replica of heaven,"⁸⁰ Bernard employed what Renna calls a "new twist" when he proclaimed that "the church being dedicated is actually 'ourselves,' the monastic community: not the community in the abstract, but the aggregate of monks present in the audience."⁸¹ In this manner Bernard proclaims to his assembled brethren:

⁷⁸ Ibid., 80.

⁷⁹ Regarding the latter clause, Renna argues for a strong relationship between exegeses related to the Temple and the importance of the physical site of the destroyed Temple in Jerusalem during the First Crusade within the thought of western Christian theologians; see, Ibid.

⁸⁰ On this point, see also Harris, "The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages," 241.

⁸¹ Renna, "Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon," 80. The "twist" is not so new here after discussing Bernard's exegetical program in the last chapter. As it relates to developments in the evolving idea of the Temple in medieval Christian thought, it may or may not be as much of a "twist" as Renna perceives it to be. Jennifer Harris, who quite fully considers the various uses of the Temple in the medieval Christian imagination in her dissertation, "The Place of the Jerusalem Temple in the Reform of the Church in the Eleventh Century," provides helpful additional context in her later article; see, Harris, "The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages," 233–256.

For what sanctity might these stones (*lapides isti*) possess, that we should celebrate a solemn ritual of them? Certainly they have holiness, *but on account of your bodies*. For indeed, does anyone doubt that your bodies, which are the temple of the Holy Spirit, are themselves holy (1 Corinthians 6:19)?⁸²

Ultimately Renna concludes, as do I, that Bernard united ideas of the Temple and the “heavenly Jerusalem” to the monks as corporate and individual bodies pursuing heavenly ascension while on earth, and Renna states that “Bernard was the first commentator to integrate these notions around the specific *vita* of the monk.”⁸³ I fundamentally agree with Renna’s interpretation of Bernard’s exegetical project, but I disagree that Aelred’s exegetical works do not reflect “innovations” similar to those of Bernard.

Aelred regularly uses buildings and the spatial arrangements of buildings within the biblical text as a part of his exegetical thought. Aelred’s use of these buildings, such as municipal walls (for examples, the walls of Pharaoh’s kingdom or the walls of Jerusalem), towers (for example, the Tower of Babel), courts, gates, and temples (particularly the Temple of Jerusalem), all stand in arrangement to one another within a spiritual and exegetical topography, and the arrangement of these buildings represents a particular interpretation of the hierarchy of creation. The buildings, and especially the stones used to build the buildings, are representations both of groups of people and of the relationships of these groups to one another and to God. Aelred’s “Jerusalem” captures the total composition of the Church Militant, but he focuses upon the small population of “living stones” who build up the Temple. These particular “living

⁸² [Emphasis mine.] “Quid enim lapides isti potuerunt sanctitatis habere, et eorum sollemnia celebremus? Habent utique sanctitatem, sed propter corpora vestra. An vero corpora vestra sancta esse quid dubitet, quae templum Spiritus Sancti sunt” (Sermon 1, *In dedicatione ecclesiae*, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones II*, 370–371.).

⁸³ Renna, “Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon,” 82. Renna concludes that “Bernard’s telescoping of several traditions of Temple exegesis illustrates how early Cistercians responded to current events. It has often been noted that the Cistercians further spiritualized commonplace ideas, activities, and places. Thus Bernard brought together soul and Church in his unique vision of the Temple of Jerusalem”; *Ibid.*, 84.

stones,” the monks of the Cistercian Order, remain closest to the point of hierophany, and so they exist within the liminal paradox of being “neither living nor dead,” neither wholly members of the Church Militant nor wholly members of the Church Triumphant. Aelred’s monks of “living stones,” who dwell inside and compose the Temple—a Temple which looks, in practice, very much like the Cistercian monastery—appear remarkably similar to Bernard’s “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God,” the *lapides* that “on account of their bodies” make the Cistercian church and cloister into a sacred space.

At the conclusion to his article on “Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon,” Thomas Renna rather somberly writes:

Bernard of Clairvaux stands at the end of an era. He was the last monastic author to integrate the biblical Temple of Jerusalem into a grand vision of Christian society.... It is sometimes said that the first crusade released some of man’s basest instincts. The Cistercians, however, transformed the crusade into a force for hope. Bishop Augustine of Hippo may have turned his episcopal house into a cloister, but he continued to worship at the Temple, the new City of God. It was left to the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux to turn the City of God into a monastery.⁸⁴

I appreciate Renna’s position, and I think that his discussion of the exegetical literature surrounding the Temple up to Bernard and his contemporaries proves useful when considering the construction of sacred space as a product of the interpretation of Scripture and tradition. I also think, however, that Renna may have concluded differently if he had had different materials available to him.

In particular, I have in mind the work of Helinand of Froidmont, and I would like to discuss one of his sermons, which I will argue shows that, rather than a representative of the end of an era, Bernard’s conceptualization of sacred space becomes part of an ongoing trope within Cistercian exegetical thought. In this next section, I will demonstrate that Helinand’s preaching utilized elements of Bernard’s *Sermons on the Ascension* and ideas encapsulated by Aelred’s

⁸⁴ Renna, “Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon,” 85.

discussion of “living stones” in order to establish a sacred Temple-space for the pursuit of ascent into God within the monk’s intellect as a way of responding to the very political climate that Renna argued “caused Bernard’s solution quickly [to come] apart in succeeding centuries.”⁸⁵

HELINAND OF FROIDMONT AND THE TEMPLE OF ASCENSION

Helinand of Froidmont (c. 1160–1237) was born in northern France, in the vicinity of Beauvais.⁸⁶ As a youth, he studied at the local cathedral school under Ralph of Beauvais (d. after 1180), a former pupil of Bernard’s rival, Peter Abelard (1079–1142). Helinand’s education would have corresponded to the pinnacle of Ralph’s intellectual activity, and Beverly Kienzle has argued that Ralph’s influence is palpable within Helinand’s sermonic corpus.⁸⁷ Ralph, “the grammarian,” was known for a “method particularly notable for its abundant use of illustrative citations,” and Helinand, trained in his master’s style of erudite *auctoritates*, packed his sermons with a wide range of sources spanning classical, patristic, and Cistercian authors.⁸⁸ As Kienzle

⁸⁵ Ibid., 84.

⁸⁶ For a short biography of Helinand and his works, see Timothy M. Baker and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “Hélinand of Froidmont,” *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*, 10 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015), http://www.degruyter.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/view/EBR/key_4b5cbba3-0582-4e54-a5d3-737c9f27fb8b.

⁸⁷ Helinand, in his *Chronicon*, writes: “my teacher, who taught me from childhood, was also a student of Peter Abelard. Ralph, an Englishman, known as ‘the Grammarian,’ of the church of Beauvais, was a man learned as much in religious as in secular texts” (*huius etiam Petri Abaelardi discipulus fuit magister meus, qui me docuit a puero, Radulphus, natione Anglicus, cognomento Grammaticus, Ecclesiae Beluacensis, uir tam in diuinis quam in saecularibus litteris eruditus*) (*PL* 212, col. 1035D). See also, Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 176.

⁸⁸ Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “Deed and Word. Hélinand’s Toulouse Sermons I,” in *Erudition at God’s Service. Studies in Medieval Cistercian History 11*, ed. J. R. Sommerfeldt, Cistercian Studies Series 98 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1987), 267–276, here 268. For a fuller discussion of Ralph’s grammatical works, see Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter, “Grammatical Commentaries From the ‘School’ of Ralph of Beauvais, ca. 1165–1175,” in *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric : Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300–1475* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 511–517. See also, R. W. Hunt, “Studies on Priscian in the Twelfth Century II: The School of Ralph of Beauvais,” *Medieval and Renaissance Studies 2* (1950): 1–56.

has explained, “Helinand’s use of classical authors is striking indeed, as Helinand’s repertoire of classical citations far exceeds other preachers of his day.”⁸⁹ Edmé R. Smits, who directed the project to edit Helinand’s *Chronicon* until his death, argued similarly that Helinand’s use of certain classical and medieval sources indicated that Helinand must have spent some time around the university at Paris.⁹⁰ Indeed, Helinand’s presence in Paris is corroborated by his autobiographical account of hearing a musician there.⁹¹ Music and the arts played a significant role in Helinand’s life for, although biographical details of Helinand’s pre-monastic life remain scarce, scholars agree that Helinand expressed his creativity and wit as a *trouvère*, one of the poet-composers of northern France, until an abrupt spiritual conversion led him to the *ordo Cisterciensis*.⁹²

Sometime between 1182 and 1190, Helinand left the court for the cloister. So sudden was his worldly withdrawal, in fact, that his adoring public maintained considerable doubt over

⁸⁹ Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “Erudition at God’s Service: Hélinand’s Toulouse Sermons II,” in *Erudition at God’s Service*, ed. J. R. Sommerfeldt, Cistercian Studies Series 98 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1987), 277–290, here 281. For more information on Ralph of Beauvais and on Helinand’s use of secular and sacred literature, see Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “Education in the Late Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries. The Witness of Hélinand of Froidmont,” in *Faith Seeking Understanding. Learning and the Catholic Tradition*, ed. G. Berthold (Manchester, NH: Saint Anselm College Press, 1991), 77–88, esp. 78–80 and 83–86.

⁹⁰ Edmé R. Smits, “Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text of Seneca’s Tragedies,” *Mnemosyne* 36, no. fasc. 3–4 (1983): 324–358, here 339. Helinand’s *Chronicon* was a multivolume (49 vols.) chronicle of the world from creation to Helinand’s present. Most volumes, however, are now lost, and only two partial manuscripts of the text remain: MS. Vat. Reg. lat. 535 and London BL Cotton Claudius B IX.

⁹¹ Helinand recalls that, “once, while I was a young man, I was in Paris and I remember that I saw a certain musician there” (*olim cum adolescentior essem Parisius memini me ibi uidisse musicum quemdam*) (Paris, Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 23va). For some discussion of this passage, see Anne T. Thayer, “Judith and Mary: Helinand’s Sermon for the Assumption,” in *Medieval Sermons and Society: Proceedings of International Symposia at Kalamazoo and New York*, ed. J. Hamesse et al. (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998), 63–75, here 72.

⁹² For more on Helinand’s career as a *trouvère*, see Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 177.

the genuineness of the trouvère Helinand's newfound religious convictions.⁹³ Speaking autobiographically in a sermon on the Ascension, Helinand, now "of Froidmont," described his conversion as a three-stage progression: first, he explained that an angel attempted to bring about his spiritual conversion without success. Next, he spoke of the beginning of his true conversion in "a pure man, like the great prophet Moses, [who] sought after me and he found me *working with mud and brick*, serving the devil in soft (*molli*) and womanish luxury (*effeminata luxuria*), in hard and obstinate vice."⁹⁴ Ultimately, however, Helinand stresses that his conversion was completed through Jesus Christ personally who "sought [him] out, found [him], led [him], and brought [him] up into the mountain of his sanctification."⁹⁵ Helinand's conversion narrative, with its imagery of mud bricks as a marker of "womanish worldliness" and its clear hierarchy between Moses (or, shall we say, the "Jew" or the "Law") and Christ (clearly the "Christian" or "grace"), fits well within the paradigms established by Aelred, with whom Helinand shows a great affinity.⁹⁶ The idea of Christ being both the initiator and the guide necessary for ascent up the mountain also appears frequently as a theme in Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension*.

⁹³ See PL 212, col. 748D–749A; also, Kienzle, Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229, 177.

⁹⁴ [Emphasis mine.] "... hominem purum, quamuis prophetam magnum, scilicet Moysen, quaesiuit me, et inuenit me in luto et latere laborantem molli et effeminata luxuria, dura et obstinata malitia diabolo seruientem" (Sermon 14, *In Ascensione Domini*, in PL 212, col. 592A, B). For more on Helinand's conversion, see Beverly Mayne Kienzle, "Maternal Imagery in the Sermons of Helinand of Froidmont," in *De Ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. Thomas L. Amos, Eugene A. Green, and Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1989), 93–103, here 99.

⁹⁵ "Tandem Deus per hominem Deum, id est per Jesum Christum me quaesiuit, inuenit, duxit, et induxit in montem sanctificationis suae" (PL 212, col. 592B). By describing his conversion as a three-fold process, Helinand refutes his detractors and implicitly denies the "suddenness" of his religious conviction. Moreover, by creating a tiered model to his journey, Helinand transforms his own life into an exemplar for his brethren akin to other tiered pursuits of ascent, such as those found in Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension*.

⁹⁶ One of Helinand's sermons, for example, presents a line-by-line, in some cases word-by-word commentary on the *Sermo in Adventu* that opens Aelred's *Homilies on the Burdens of Isaiah*; cf.

Helinand may have removed himself from the world when he began to ascend the mountain with Christ, but he did not cease to regard the events within it. From 1193 to 1197, Helinand wrote *Les Vers de la Mort* (*Verses on Death*), a work that both satirized and chastised the figure of Philip Augustus—along with the bishops supporting him—for his intent to divorce Ingeborg of Denmark.⁹⁷ The poem, which gained widespread popularity and which introduced a new poetic stanza into medieval French literature (twelve octosyllabic lines with the rhyme scheme: *aabaabbbabba*), is credited as one of the motivating factors for the decision made by the Cistercian General Chapter in 1199 to issue the injunction that "monks who create verses are to be sent away to foreign houses, not to be brought back except by order of the General Chapter."⁹⁸ Thus, even after his conversion, the monk of Froidmont maintained (to a degree) the public voice and the creative spirit of Helinand the poet. Both in *Verses on Death* and in his sermons, Helinand used his public voice to speak out against actions that he perceived to have departed from proper virtue-centric Christian behavior.

Inside the cloister, Helinand's poetic creativity found continued expression in his sermons, most of which are directed toward his monastic brethren. As Kienzle observes, "for Helinand, the three principal duties of the preacher are nurturing the divine Word, setting an example of virtuous living, and admonishing others."⁹⁹ Helinand favored the topos of "preacher

Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 86rb–88ra and Aelred of Rievaulx, *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera omnia*, 2D: 6–20.

⁹⁷ See Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 178–179; and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, "The Sermon as Goad and Nail. Preaching in Hélinand of Froidmont," in *Goad and Nail: Studies in Medieval Cistercian History* 9, ed. E. R. Elder, Cistercian Studies Series 84 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1985), 228–240, here 230–231.

⁹⁸ "monachi qui rythmos fecerint, ad domos alienas emittantur, non reuersuri nisi per capitulum generale"; see Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 178–179; Kienzle, "The Sermon as Goad and Nail. Preaching in Hélinand of Froidmont," 231. See, also, William D. Paden, "De monachis rithmos facientibus: Hélinant de Froidmont, Bertran de Born, and the Cistercian General Chapter of 1199," *Speculum* 55, no. 4 (October 1980): 669–685.

⁹⁹ Kienzle, "The Sermon as Goad and Nail. Preaching in Hélinand of Froidmont," 228.

as mother” in the fulfillment of his duties, and maternal imagery appears frequently in his sermons. Through imagery of “fruitfulness,” Helinand links the fruitfulness of motherhood and the fruitfulness of good deeds to the preaching of fruitful doctrine through eloquence.¹⁰⁰

Helinand considered Mary, Mother of God and patron saint of the Cistercian Order, as the model for fruitful action, and he presents her as the exemplar toward whom the monks of the Order should aspire. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that he who preached the mothering role of Mary would describe the brethren as Mary's vassals.¹⁰¹ Drawing upon his own experience of conversion, Helinand treated the role of the preacher as that of an instructor, a guide meant to accompany those under the care of Mary and Christ up the mountain and into the city of God.

In addition to preaching “*ad monachos*,” to his Cistercian community, Helinand had occasion to preach “*ad clericos*,” presumably to secular and regular clergy outside of his order. As an example of the latter, Helinand preached four important sermons in 1229 for the inauguration of the University of Toulouse and for the November synod.¹⁰² These Toulouse sermons are valuable, since they give a voice to doubts held by some Christian leaders watching the universities grow in prominence. Even though he had spent time within both the schools and the monasteries, and even though he was living at the cusp of the influential shift from monasticism to scholasticism within Christendom, Helinand remained skeptical of the growing university culture. The pursuit of knowledge in the university, untethered as Helinand felt that it

¹⁰⁰ See *PL* 212, col. 555A; cf. Bede’s interpretation of Luke 6:43–48, above. See also, Kienzle, “Maternal Imagery in the Sermons of Helinand of Froidmont,” 95. On the use of maternal imagery by twelfth-century Cistercians, see Caroline Walker Bynum, “Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing,” in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 110–169.

¹⁰¹ See *PL* 212, col. 495D.

¹⁰² Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 182–192. For further treatment of the Toulouse sermons, see Kienzle, “Deed and Word. Hélinand’s Toulouse Sermons I,” 267–276; and Kienzle, “Erudition at God’s Service: Hélinand’s Toulouse Sermons II,” 277–290.

was from the pursuit of virtue, was a matter of great concern for him. As he would memorably lament, "see how the clerics in Paris pursue liberal arts; in Orleans, authors; in Bologna, codices; in Salerno, medicine boxes; in Toledo, magic; and nowhere, virtue."¹⁰³

Sixty-nine sermons are presently accounted to Helinand. Of these sixty-nine, twenty-eight appear in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, reproducing a 1669 edition by Bertrand Tissier, the only witness to a manuscript (or to manuscripts) now lost.¹⁰⁴ The remaining sermons reside in two manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 14591 and Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 1041. Parallel texts between Migne and BnF 14591 and between Migne and Bib. Maz. 1041 are occasional, and critical editions of these sermons do not exist. Moreover, most of the unique sermons held in the two extant manuscripts remain unedited, with only several single-sermon editions presented by Kienzle. The sermon that I discuss here, preached by Helinand on the feast of the Assumption of Mary in mid-August, appears for the first time in edited form as Appendix I to this project.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ "Ecce quaerunt clerici Parisius artes liberales, Aurelianis auctores, Bononiae codices, Salerni pyxides, Toleti daemones, et nusquam mores" (*PL* 212, col. 603B, C). In his sermon on the Assumption below, Helinand returns to this verse from Colossians to distinguish between Solomon's "wisdom" and the superior, true wisdom of Christ. He concludes: "In every way [Christ] stands greater than Solomon," (*In hiis omnibus, plusquam Salomon hic*) (Bib. Maz 1041, f. 48ra: line 23 in the present edition [all subsequent line numbers refer to my edition, Appendix I below]). For more on Helinand's critique of gaining university knowledge without moral virtue, see Kienzle, "The Sermon as Goad and Nail. Preaching in Hélinand of Froidmont," 235. Bernard of Clairvaux made a similar observation to his monks in one of his *Sermons on the Ascension*, he warns that when people flee from the mountain of Christ, they turn to the mountain of worldly knowledge (*montem scientiae*) where they devote themselves to secular things and, "thus they build Babel, thinking that they shall become like God," (*Sic aedificant Babel, sic putant ad Dei se perventuros similitudinem*) (Sermon 4.5.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 141.).

¹⁰⁴ Bertrand Tissier, *Bibliothecae Patrum Cisterciensium*, vol. 6 (Bonofonte, 1669), 106–306.

¹⁰⁵ For additional details on this sermon and on the manuscript witnesses, see Appendix I below.

Following a rather hastily added rubric in the manuscript, Helinand presumably preached the sermon that I would now explore around August 15 (year unknown), on the feast of the Assumption of Mary (*In assumptione Beatae Mariae*).¹⁰⁶ The sermon begins in the expected manner of high medieval monastic sermons, citing a biblical pericope followed by the identification of the liturgical occasion and presenting a basic division to the structure of the sermon.¹⁰⁷ In this case, Helinand has chosen to speak on the installation of the Ark of the Covenant within Solomon's newly built Temple to God. He begins:

In those days, *all of the elders of Israel, the heads of the tribes, and the leaders of the families gathered together in order to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord to the city of David, that is to say, Zion. And the priests brought it into Jerusalem, into its courts, into the mercy-seat (the oracle) of the Temple, into the Holy of Holies, under the wings of the cherubim.* This is to say, "Maria is taken up into heaven, let the angels rejoice, praising let them bless the Lord." Solomon [is an archetype for] Christ; the Ark [for] Mary; the priests and the elders [for] the angels; the mercy-seat of the Temple [for] the most sublime par of the Empyrean.

¹⁰⁶ For the occasions of Helinand's other sermons, see Johannes Baptist Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters: für d. Zeit von 1150–1350*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen 43 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1969), 617–622.

¹⁰⁷ This sermon offers four elements—1.) Salomon Christus; 2.) archa Maria; 3.) sacerdotes vel seniores angeli; 4.) oraculum templi sublimissima pars empirei celi—rather than the typical three for consideration. The basic structure fits within the monastic sermon genre, however. Helinand, living during the cusp of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is, in many ways, a transitional figure, and his sermons reflect some elements of the transition from monasticism to scholasticism as the dominant trend within Christendom despite his distrust of universities. The effect of this intellectual shift may underlie Helinand's divergence from the traditional monastic pattern. As Richard and Mary Rouse have observed: "Helinand of Froidmont (d. after 1230), a Cistercian who spent time at the schools, leaves us sermons that show how the influence of school sermon structure begins to affect the homily of the cloister. Helinand's sermons are sometimes divided, sometimes only haphazardly, sometimes not at all"; Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus Florum of Thomas of Ireland* (Toronto, 1979), 71f. Likewise, Beverly Kienzle has noted that "[Helinand] is typical of the early thirteenth-century sermon writer who lists, distinguishes, and divides, but lacks an imposed structure, an overall division with subdivisions"; Kienzle, "Erudition at God's Service: Hélinand's Toulouse Sermons II," 283.

The parts of this exposition shall now be explained in greater detail, step by step.¹⁰⁸

The Assumption of Mary is clearly marked out as the occasion for the sermon; however, this particular sermon concludes with a somewhat unexpected invocation. Relying upon a familiar verse from Bernard's *Sermons on the Ascension*, Helinand concludes his sermon on the Assumption with a modified quotation of Ephesians 4:10, "may Jesus Christ our Lord, as much mortal as he is spiritual, *who ascends today over all the heavens* lead us on and make us go up through the steps of merit."¹⁰⁹ This is somewhat odd. In addition to using a verse that one would expect on the feast of the Ascension, Helinand, like Bernard, has also added the word "today" to his biblical quotation. In the pages that follow, I will argue that, rather than some kind of mistaken ambiguity, Helinand has chosen this Ascension-specific verse because this sermon attempts to relate the Ascension of Christ to the Assumption of Mary insofar as Helinand wants his followers to imitate both Mary and Christ in their ascent into God in order that they, too, might ascend. In using mother and child as exemplars for perfection and heavenly ascent, the Assumption of Mary and the Ascension of Christ become blurred, almost synonymous, events.

This sermon of Helinand, which relates Mary and Jesus to various meditations upon the historical, allegorical, moral, and eschatological significances of the Temple within the Christian tradition, is neither unique nor is it the first of its kind chronologically. Jennifer Harris, for

¹⁰⁸ "*In diebus illis, congregati sunt omnes maiores natu Israel, et principes tribuum, ac duces familiarum ad regem salomonem, ut deferrent archam federis Domini de ciuitate Dauid; hoc est, de Syon. Et intulerunt eam sacerdotes in Ierusalem, in locum suum, in oraculum templi, in sanctum sanctorum, subter alas cherubin* (1 Kings 8). Hoc est dicere, "assumpta est maria in celum, gaudent angeli, laudantes benedicent Dominum." Salomon Christus; archa Maria; sacerdotes vel seniores angeli; oraculum templi sublimissima pars empirei celi. Singule partes huius expositionis latius explicande sunt" (Paris, Bib. Maz 1041, f. 48ra, lines 1–8).

¹⁰⁹ "ad quod nos perducatur et per gradus meritorum ascendere faciat *qui hodie ascendit super omnes celos* tam mortales quam spirituales Ihesus Christus Dominus Noster" (Paris, Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 51rb, lines 374–376).

example, in her study of Helinand's contemporary, Adam of Dryburgh (1140–1212), has “examine[d] the way in which the biblical equivalence of Jesus's body with the Jerusalem Temple was incorporated into eleventh- and twelfth-century ideas about the nature of the body and the self.”¹¹⁰ Adam, who first joined the Anglo-Scottish Premonstratensian house of Dryburgh in 1165, but later joined the Carthusians at Witham around 1184, authored a number of theological texts and is credited with about 60 surviving sermons. Harris considered one sermon in particular, “On the exercises of religious conversion,” (*De exercitio religiosae conversationis*), which was composed around 1185.¹¹¹

Adam's “On the exercises of religious conversion” focuses on the now quite familiar Temple passages of Luke 2. In this particular instance, Adam considered the figure of the prophetess Anna (Luke 2:36–38), who “never left the Temple but worshiped there with fasting and prayer night and day.”¹¹² Adam treated these verses by describing “eight biblical representations of the Temple from which Anna did not depart: the body of Christ, Mary, the Church, the believers, the human body, the mind, the human and angelic intellect, and heaven.”¹¹³ Similarly, in the introduction to his Assumption sermon, Helinand proposed to discuss Christ, Mary, the Church, angels and believers, although he placed them all within the context of the procession conducted by Solomon and the elders into the Temple and up to the Holy of Holies wherein the Ark is to be installed.

Harris uses Adam's sermon to discuss twelfth-century theology related to the nature of the body of Christ as the Temple-Church and as the Eucharist and the nature of the body of Mary

¹¹⁰ Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” 233–256, here 233.

¹¹¹ For an introduction to Adam and his sermon, see *Ibid.*, 236; The text of this sermon is found in *PL* 198, col. 363–372.

¹¹² “...quae non discedebat de templo, jejuniis et obsecrationibus serviens nocte ac die” (Luke 2:37).

¹¹³ Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” 236. Cf. *PL* 198, col. 364D–365B.

as the bearer of God and thus the Temple of God. All of these ideas appear in some way within Helinand's sermon. I will focus on Helinand's theology of the Temple as a point of ascension, however, because this appears to be the primary motivation behind his exegetical construction. Following Kobialka's distinction between "place" and "space," we might best describe Adam of Dryburgh's sermon as describing the Temple as a "place," a static locus within which various kinds of biblical and traditional interpretations may be stably grounded in order to enrich our understanding of an important religious motif. Helinand's Temple, on the other hand, is better described as a "space" insofar as the Temple site for Helinand is dynamic, relying upon vectors of both time (historical and eschatological) and space (inner movement) as a way of depicting a central aspect of the Cistercian monastic endeavor, namely personal and communal ascent into, and union with, God. Helinand's interest in Cistercian practices of ascent is likewise neither unique nor novel to Helinand; he draws much of his insights from earlier Cistercians preoccupied with this spiritual ideal.

Bernard of Clairvaux's *Sermons on the Ascension* represent a definitive exegetical backdrop for Helinand's sermon, so much so that, even when he is not quoting from or alluding to Bernard directly, Helinand's interpretive structure demonstrates well Brian Stock's position that the "text" of the "textual community" is affected and evolves over time under the influence of charismatic wielders of communal scriptures. For example, recall in Bernard's *Second Sermon on the Ascension*, that Bernard described a liturgical and a final procession comprised of angels and of the faithful, called "*virī Galilaei*," to the right hand of God.¹¹⁴ Helinand echoes Bernard when he relates his monastic audience to these same "*virī Galilaei*" about whose actions of ascent he proclaims:

¹¹⁴ Sermon 2.4, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 128.

[Like Christ] let us ascend from the bad to the good, from the good to the better, and from the better to the best so that we might be made just and so we might be glorified. ... According to these ascensions, the Disciples of Christ have been called today “the men of Galilee”; that is, according to these threefold transmigrations: the transmigration of flesh, of soul, and of spirit.¹¹⁵

Just as Bernard related the interpretation of Jesus’ final moments with his Apostles prior to his Ascension to Cistercian action and Cistercian liturgy “today” (*hodie*) and just as Bernard described his monks as “*virī Galilaei*” following the words of the angelic messenger, Helinand admonishes his monks to descend and to ascend like Christ in order that they might be deemed worthy of Christ-like merit.

Helinand depicts Christ’s act of Ascension as one accomplished in ten stages when he recounts:

Thus Christ ascended over the clouds, over the realm of air, over the ethereal realm, over the stars, over the cherubim and over the thrones, over the wings of the winds, over all the orders of the angels, over all the powers of heaven, up to the throne of Majesty of the Father, [where] he has been seated at His right hand.¹¹⁶

Bernard similarly described a staged progression of Christ’s Ascension as a journey of ten days.¹¹⁷ As noted above, Bernard’s exegetical and liturgical interpretation of Christ’s Ascension was known to Helinand, as evidenced by his *Chronicon* entry for the year 1151.¹¹⁸ Helinand presentation of Christ’s Ascension by way of a stepwise progression, in addition to the

¹¹⁵ “Similite ascendamus de malo ad bonum, de bono ad melius, de meliori ad optimum ut iustificemur, ut glorificemur. ... Propter has ascensiones uocati sunt hodie discipuli Christi ‘uiri galilei’; id est transmigrantes triplices: transmigratio carnis, anime, et spiritus” (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 50vb, lines 318–325).

¹¹⁶ “et sic [Christus] ascendit super omnem nubem, et super omnem aerem, super ethera, et super sidera. Super cherubin et super thronos uolauit. *Uolauit super pennas uentorum*, super omnes ordines angelorum, super omnes uirtutes celorum usque ad solium maiestatis paterne et dextre illius obsessum” (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 50va, lines 304–307).

¹¹⁷ Clermont-Ferrand MS. 33, f. 195, presented by Jean Leclercq, “Études Sur S. Bernard et Le Texte de Ses écrits,” *Analecta Cisterciensia* 9 (1953): 45–83, here 68. See also, Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 315.

¹¹⁸ *PL* 212, col. 1057D; Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 314.

structural and interpretive elements that Helinand borrowed from Bernard's processional account of the Ascension of Christ, demonstrates that Helinand drew considerably from, at the very least, Bernard's Second *Sermon on the Ascension* for his sermon on the Assumption. If, in fact, we consider Bernard's Fourth Sermon on the Ascension, we see further continuities with Helinand's sermon on the Assumption.

In his Fourth Sermon on the Ascension, Bernard focused generally upon the idea of the feast of the Ascension as the pinnacle of the monastic liturgical year. In this regard, Bernard argued that the Ascension of Christ should hold pride of place because this moment provided both the path that the monks must follow in their pursuit of ascending into God and the guide necessary to pursue that path by the advent of the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit. Christ's descent and ascent represent the properly ordered alternative to the Fall, and, in service to this idea, Bernard exhorted his brethren to begin their ascent up the mountain of God by building the house of God within their hearts:

I beseech you, my brothers, not to weigh down your hearts with worldly cares... Lift up your hearts towards him with the hands of your cognition, that you might regard the transfigured Lord. Form in your hearts not only the tabernacles of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, but every house of that holy one, the manifold mansions, similar to that sacrifice of jubilation, which ardently rings out within the Tabernacle of the Lord, singing and proclaiming that psalm unto the Lord, "How delightful is your Tabernacle, O Lord Almighty! My soul longs and even faints in the courts of the Lord."¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹ "Obsecro vos, fratres mei, non graventur corda vestra in curis saecularibus; nam de crapula et ebrietat—gratias Deo—non magnopere necesse habeo vos admonere Exonerate, obsecro, corda vestra gravi mole terrenarum cogitationum, ut sciatis mirificatum a Domino sanctum suum. Levate corda vestra cum manibus quibusdam cogitationum, ut transfiguratum Dominum videatis. Formate in cordibus vestris non modo Patriarcharum et Prophetarum tabernacula, sed omnes domus illius caelestis multiplices mansiones, secundum eum, qui circuibat immolans in tabernaculo Domini hostiam vociferationis, cantans et psalmum illum dicens Domino: *quam dilecta tabernacula tua, domine virtutum! concupiscit et deficit anima mea in atria domini*, (Psalm 83:2)" (Sermon 5.9.1, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 145. For Kienzle's translation, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*, 51.).

In order to build this multifaceted Tabernacle within their hearts, Bernard asked his audience to travel in spirit past the many thrones of the heavenly mansions, to bow before the Throne of God and the Lamb, and to greet and to behold the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, the Martyrs and the Virgins. Here, as above with Bernard's and Aelred's narrowing of the 'Church' to a specific list of saintly individuals and with Aelred's topographical progression into the Temple built on the foundation of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, Bernard's mystical journey presented his congregation with a similar list of those whose "song" they are meant to sing.¹²⁰ Helinand's strategy for ascent is somewhat different from his predecessors'; however, his sermon on the Assumption of Mary revisits the idea of ascent as conceptualized by movement through increasingly sacred spaces towards the Mercy Seat of God. Whereas Bernard asked his monks to contemplate this Temple vision in their hearts so that they might pursue such an ascent in their daily lives, Helinand presents a united program of internalized and externalized practice by using typologies of Solomon (Christ), Mary (Ark), and the Elders (Angels [only partially considered]) as interpretive actors meant to structure the journey into the Holy of Holies. With each typological pair, the movement of the biblical person or object or group towards its final goal in the Holy of Holies teaches the monks something about their own journeys into God.

Helinand begins his sermon, as we saw above, with a fairly extensive quotation from I Kings 8 that describes the moment when the Ark of the Covenant was finally installed at the Mercy Seat of the newly-constructed Temple of Solomon. The action of the Ark being brought up, or "assumed" into the Holy of Holies, anticipates the Assumption of Mary, according to Helinand. Yet, prior to investigating the scriptural mysteries related to Mary, Helinand first looks to the typological relationship between Christ and Solomon. Solomon, the "peace-maker," stands as a type for Christ as God permitted Solomon to construct the Temple in order to presage

¹²⁰ Sermon 5.9.2, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 145.

Christ's two acts of Temple-building. First Jesus Christ built (and builds) a Temple on earth when he established his Church; finally Christ Triumphant shall build a Temple at the culmination of time from "living stones" (*de lapidibus vivis*) that shall endure and shall be dedicated as the "Temple for the Living God" (*templum Dei vivi dedicaturus*).¹²¹ Bernard's and Aelred's theology, as it recurs throughout Helinand's sermons, already forms the exegetical backdrop of Helinand's interpretation here, quite early into the text of this sermon. One might reasonably expect, therefore, that Helinand will interpret the verses from 1 Kings 8 by mapping out a spiritual topography of increasing holiness following Aelred, and, in fact, Helinand closes this sermon with a quite extensive discussion of various stages (*gradus*) of "ascensions" and "descensions." First, however, he explores the cyclicity of time and aspects of the liturgical year as things which "construct" the Temple-space by likening the monk to Christ when the monk imitates the life of Christ throughout the year in concert with the other brothers.

BUILDING A TEMPLE WITHIN: USING TIME TO CONSTRUCT SPACE

Helinand's use of scriptural readings and liturgical language specific to both the Assumption of Mary and the Ascension of Christ left his audience to meditate on the deeper relationship between the "ascents" of both Christ and Mary as they relate to the Cistercians as followers of Christ and as vassals of Mary. Helinand also required the brethren to locate themselves within the temporal narrative of Christian salvation history because, in the first third of his sermon, he makes artful use of past and present time as a vehicle to exhort future action. The proper reckoning of time, following Helinand's exegetical program, is both instructive and constructive. Overall, Helinand's arguments and the *exempla* for this section of the sermon may be classified into two groups: on the one hand, he uses scenes conjured from the past—from the

¹²¹ Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 48ra, lines 15–19.

Hebrew Bible or from the New Testament—tropologically in order to encourage the monks to aspire towards holy exemplars; for example, comparing Jesus to Solomon based on Jesus’ words in Matthew relating the splendor of Solomon to the flowers of the field, Helinand notes that grass withers and flesh putrefies, but the glory of Christ “incurs no such injury of putrefaction” (*putredinis tamen iniuriam non incurrit*).¹²² On the other hand, Helinand conjures scenes drawn from daily life and from chores that have specific occasions throughout the year—activities such as sowing seeds, harvesting fruit, working metals, etc.—to ground morality within the most quotidian and mundane tasks.¹²³ By relating the “four days of Christ”—Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension—to the “four seasons of the year” (*quattuor anni tempora*)—winter, spring, summer, and autumn—the various agricultural duties of the year, such as sowing and reaping and threshing and treading grapes should remind the monks of their higher duty to imitate Christ.¹²⁴ Thus, by uniting scripture to all aspects of the monastic *conversatio*, Helinand admonishes his audience to take care of what they sow lest they should reap worms and putrefaction in place of the future fruit of eternal life.¹²⁵ In essence, Helinand tells his monks

¹²² Christ observes in Matthew 6:28–30: “And why do you worry about clothes? See how the lilies of the field grow. They neither labor nor spin. Yet I tell you that not even Solomon in all of his glory was dressed like one of these. If God so clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and tomorrow is thrown into the fire, how much more [will he do] for you, you of little faith?” (Et de vestimento quid solliciti estis? Considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt: non laborant, neque nent. Dico autem vobis, quoniam nec Salomon in omni gloria sua coopertus est sicut unum ex istis. Si autem foenum agri, quod hodie est, et cras in clibanum mittitur, Deus sic vestit, quanto magis vos modicae fidei?). Helinand discusses this passage in Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 48ra–b, lines 24–34.

¹²³ For a deeper exploration of mundane imagery and the place of manual labor in the history of the lives and interactions of Cistercian monks and lay brothers, see James France, *Separate but Equal: Cistercian Lay Brothers, 1120–1350*, Cistercian Studies Series 246 (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2012), esp. 36–56. See also Dijon MS 173, f. 41r, a Cistercian manuscript of Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job* written around 1111, in which the initial “I” depicts a monk chopping down a tree, (http://www.enluminures.culture.fr/documentation/enlumine/fr/BM/dijon_129-01.htm).

¹²⁴ Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 48rb–48va, lines 35–81.

¹²⁵ Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 48vb, lines 91–110.

that a life which follows after the saints of the past and which is reminded daily of their saintly virtues through the chores of the present will ultimately ascend in the future.

When Helinand eschews spatial metaphors for temporal ones, the result is a fuller internalization of spiritual practice than what we saw either with Bernard or with Aelred. While Bernard and Aelred both discussed the need for individual practice, the community as “citizens” or as “stones” strongly emphasized communal practice as the foundation for individual growth.¹²⁶ In other words, the spatial metaphors created an interpretive locus of sacred space wherein the pursuit of ascension may thrive. Helinand’s temporal metaphors, however, use the (communal) liturgical year to relate the individual monastic life to the life of Christ.¹²⁷ This is not exactly an inversion of established Cistercian sacred space exegeses but rather an adaption of them: the monk still seeks ascent into God within an exegetically-constructed sacred space, but this “space” increasingly reflects an internalized understanding of Christian salvation history and religious practice. Jean Leclercq, in his discussion of twelfth-century spirituality, indicated that the difference between the monks of Cluny and the monks of Cîteaux might be understood as part of the shift from externalized to internalized spirituality.¹²⁸ That shift, however, took place over extended periods of time and should not be understood as either one or the other. Helinand

¹²⁶ Bernard, for example, presents the image of the community forming one heart which must be personally lifted up in the hands of each monk in Sermon 6.5; see, Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*, 152.

¹²⁷ This is not to say that spatial and material metaphors do not, likewise, relate the monk to the life of Christ, as Marcel Pacaut has pointed out in his discussion of Helinand’s views on properly performed Cistercian liturgy and properly constructed Cistercian architecture as conduits for the imitation of Christ; see, Marcel Pacaut, *Les moines blancs: Histoire de l’ordre de Cîteaux* (Fayard, 1993), 227. Beverly Kienzle has also argued that Helinand follows Bernard and Aelred in his favor over an aesthetic of simplicity in Cistercian construction for the benefit of spiritual practice; see, Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “The House of the Lord: Hélinand on Superfluous Monastic Construction,” *Proceedings of the PMR Conference* 11 (1986): 135–141.

¹²⁸ See Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 21f.

sits further along the continuum towards internalized contemplation rather than externalized practice, but both elements of religiosity persist.

Hugh of St Victor (1096–1141), in “On the Moral Meaning of Noah’s Ark” (*De arca Noe morali*), discussed the notion of building a house for God in one’s own heart by using the faculty of memory to construct an interior space. Discussing Hugh’s project, Jennifer Harris writes:

One reads the Bible to train the memory, thus internalizing the biblical text, and converting it into the story of one’s own life, a moral narrative of scripture rooted in the believer’s heart, or memory. Through this process, the individual enlarges the heart and constructs God’s interior dwelling place, and the internal narrative shapes the ethical life of the believer.¹²⁹

Hugh presented this interiorized practice alongside externalized monastic ritual and liturgical practice as a means of more fully embodying the ideal of Christ. The Ark of Noah is cognate with the Temple.¹³⁰ Helinand’s exhortation for his monks to imitate the “Temple-builders”—Solomon and Christ—depends on the notion of the Temple as a sacred space existing both within time and persisting after the eschatological culmination of time. The stability of this exegetical space acts like a rock or an anchor grounding the discussion of ascension that pervades his sermon.

The logic behind Helinand’s interpretation and exhortation in the first third of his sermon functions because the cosmology from which he offers his guidance is both cyclical and teleological. It is cyclical insofar as Helinand posits that past events are destined to repeat and that these past events are ontologically meaningful. So, for an example, Solomon can be a type for Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ can be a type for Christ Triumphant because the typological relationships established among these figures represents a true reflection of the cyclicity of

¹²⁹ Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” 251–252. On the subject of memory, see Mary J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10 (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), esp. 44.

¹³⁰ *PL* 176, col. 617–680.

time. Since before creation, when *verbum erat apud Deum*, the Christ-paradigm existed, and historical events are merely manifestations of a prior and enduring reality. This view of history is also teleological, because it assumes that Divine Will governs all of creation and that the ultimate plan of this Will is the eschaton, the dissolution of time's cyclicality. Tropology and typology are useful because these help to describe God's "true" plan for creation, which exists superhistorically; that is, types work as types when they recount the moral message encoded in God's direction.

The death or ascension of an individual monk is not cyclical, however, but permanent. Helinand's message, which almost playfully dances from biblical figures to daily chores to Christ's final return, also sounds a somber note for those in attendance: summer turns to winter, grasses burn, humans decay, time ends. Yet, it is through this interplay of time past, present, and future, of cycles and of endpoints, of sinners and of saints, that Helinand attempts to guide his monks "up the mountain" into the heavens where he ends his sermon.

TO BE LIKE MARY, AN ARK TAKEN UP

Upon concluding his discussion of Solomon's relationship to Christ as a means to sanctify both the seasonal year and the liturgical year for his Cistercian audience, Helinand turns to consider the relationship of the Ark to Mary as a way of presenting various elements of Cistercian theology and religious practice. Not only does Helinand shift his focus, his style of exegesis shifts from temporal metaphors to physical ones. Whereas the prevailing connection between Solomon and Christ centered on "those days" (*in diebus illis*, words that Helinand has added to the biblical pericope), his association between the Ark and Mary primarily regards the material elements of the Ark as they prefigure Mary. Thus, Helinand begins this section on Mary:

We read about three Arks in Scripture: the Ark of Noah, the Ark of Moses, and the Ark of that mountain, namely, [the mountain] on the peak of which God spoke to Moses.¹³¹ The first was made of smooth wood, the second of shittim (acacia) wood, and about the third it was not said from whence it was made because it is not material, but wholly spiritual.¹³²

Helinand explains that the second Ark, the Ark of Moses (and the Ark taken up by Solomon), may be understood as a “*figura*” either for Christ, or for the Church, or for Mary, but he wants to focus on Mary.¹³³

Helinand began the previous section with an etymology of Solomon’s name (that is, “Solomon is interpreted ‘peace-maker’”), and so he begins this section with a pseudo-etymology of “shittim wood.” Helinand identifies “shittim wood” as a special wood that possesses the properties of being “light, inflammable, and unputrefiable.”¹³⁴ Just as Solomon’s three key attributes (wisdom, wealth, and glory) were compared to Christ, the three key attributes of that Ark are compared to Mary. Mary, as one expects, exhibits superior qualities in each case.¹³⁵ The Ark is not merely made from special wood, however. Scripture also states that this specially crafted wooden box was covered inside and out with fine gold. Therefore, Helinand, in an impressive litany of scriptural passages, explores the meaning of “gold” within his comparison of the Ark to Mary, and he defines “gold” in this context to refer to Mary’s divine wisdom. Mary, inside and out, is the bearer of wisdom *par excellence* because she bore Christ. Indeed, for the

¹³¹ “... montis illius, scilicet, in cuius cacumine Deus locutus est ad Moysen.” Recall, from above, that Helinand has described his own conversion as one that was begun by “a kind of” Moses who led him away from “mud and brick” and that was completed by Christ who led him “in montem sanctificationis suae” (PL 212, col. 592B). Treating Solomon, he spoke of “living stones” and here, with the Ark, he speaks of Moses and the mountain. For this and for other reasons, I think that the correlation between this sermon and Helinand’s own conversion experience proves undeniable.

¹³² Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 48vb, lines 112–114.

¹³³ Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49a, lines 120–121.

¹³⁴ “Ligna sichim dicuntur esse leuia, incremabilia, inputribilia” (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49a, line 124).

¹³⁵ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49a, lines 124–139.

same reason that the Ark was gilded in anticipation of the objects it would contain, Mary was “gilded” in preparation for Christ.¹³⁶

Wood and gold may comprise the material composition of the Ark, but the Hebrew Bible also describes the shape of the vessel, and Helinand finds importance in these details as well. The Ark of the Covenant is described in Exodus 37:1 as being “two and a half cubits long, a cubit and a half wide, and a cubit and a half tall”; that is, a rectangular prism. According to Helinand, Mary may be said to be “quadratic” because she remains firm and constant; that is, she possesses equanimity. Mary is said to have “sides longer than the others” because “longitude has two intervals: in front and behind,” and she remains grounded in the present while extending herself toward what lies ahead.¹³⁷ Thus, Helinand observes, Mary represents perfect faith in Christ (in whom there is neither past nor future, only present) who descends from the Father and ascends to the Father on behalf of humankind.¹³⁸

Helinand’s presentation of Mary as a gilded Ark bearing the Christ Child, as she who possesses the supreme virtues and perfect faith in Christ, represents both a traditionally positive view of Mary (especially common among members of the Cistercian Order) and a practical exemplar for his audience to follow. Helinand began the sermon by creating an exegetical Temple-space constructed as a site of identification between the *conversatio* of the individual monk and the life of Christ, and now he depicts Mary as an Ark, a vessel for God and an object whose material composition and structure reflects the physical presence of the Temple on a smaller scale. Mary—the Ark—whose body bore Christ, is borne by Christ—Solomon—into the Temple where she is placed at the site of the highest holiness. The monks, likewise, are expected to internalize the Temple in their imitation of Christ and, thus, to unite their lives with the life of

¹³⁶ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49ra–b, lines 140–157.

¹³⁷ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49rb, lines 158–165.

¹³⁸ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49rb, lines 165–175.

Christ. By imitating Mary—the Ark bearing Christ within them—the monks are led by Christ up and into the Holy of Holies. Helinand’s monks, therefore, by embodying the qualities of Christ and Mary, transform their bodies into a microcosm that reflects the temporal and physical macrocosm encompassing all of Christian salvation history from creation, through the events of the Old and New Testaments, into the eschaton.¹³⁹

TO BE LIKE CHRIST, ASCENDING AND DESCENDING

Helinand relates his macroscopic view of the cosmos to the human microcosm by highlighting the way in which the “cyclical” nature of Christ—that is, Christ’s descending and ascending—may serve as a guide for a monastic audience seeking the perfection that comes from ascent into God. As such, the third section of Helinand’s sermon provides direction for *imitatio Christi* by offering a series of explanations for “descent” and “ascent” within the context of one of Bernard’s favorite Ascension verses, Ephesians 4:10, “he who descended is the very one who ascended,” (*qui descendit ipse est et qui ascendit*).¹⁴⁰ Bernard stressed the “descent” of Christ as a singular act of humbling himself in historical time in order to show fallen humanity how to ascend in liturgical time. This liturgical cyclicity persists until Christ, in his final—and timeless—act of descent and ascent on the Day of Judgment, leads all of his saints to the right hand of God. Helinand’s exhortations focus on the present period of lived liturgical cyclicity, so he presents multiple stages of “descension” and “ascension” as sites of progress for his monastic audience. Thus, in the first third of his sermon, Helinand stressed temporal metaphors

¹³⁹ The relationship between the macrocosm and the human microcosm may be best known from Origen’s third century account in *Peri Archon*. For a discussion of the rising importance of the theology or philosophy of man-as-microcosm through the twelfth century, see Marie Dominique Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, 2nd revised, MART: The Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 28–37.

¹⁴⁰ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49va, line 186.

related to aligning the monk's life to the life of Christ; he discussed material metaphors in the middle part of his sermon to teach the imitation of Mary; and he concludes his discourse by using spatial metaphors to teach the monks to follow Christ and Mary and to ascend from their interior Temple into God.

Christ's descent, according to Helinand, "must be understood in a two-fold way: locally and morally."¹⁴¹ Locally (or historically and physically), Christ descended into the world, into Egypt, in the grave, and into hell in order to provide salvation to humankind. The saints (*sancti*) thereafter imitate Christ by increasingly humbling themselves, subjecting themselves and developing contempt for the world, even contempt for their very selves.¹⁴² Morally (or, one might say, theologically), Christ descended from his very self within the Godhead, placed himself beneath the angels, and finally placed himself beneath all of humanity. Helinand asks why (*Quare autem sic descendit?*). Helinand's answer is powerful, and it resonates throughout the spiritual works of the Cistercian exegetes presented in this study. He explains: "Clearly [Christ] descended not for himself but for us, as it was written: 'who, for humankind and for our salvation he descended from heaven.' *God descended to humankind so that the human might ascend to God.*"¹⁴³

Helinand devotes a substantial portion of this Assumption sermon on the theology and the exegetical tradition related to the idea of Christ's Ascension. In fact, of the 376 lines of text in my edition of this sermon, 97 lines (lines 211–308) or just over 25% of the sermon, discuss Christ's act of Ascension as it relates to his nature as both man and God, as it relates to the idea

¹⁴¹ "Descensus iste dupliciter intelligendus est: localiter et moraliter" (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49va, line 187).

¹⁴² Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49va–b, lines 187–203.

¹⁴³ [Emphasis mine.] "Certe descendit non sibi sed nobis, sicut scriptum est: 'qui proper homines et nostram salutem descendit de celis.' Descendit Deus ab homine ut homo ascenderet ad Deum" (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 49vb, lines 204–211, here 209–211).

of the will, as it relates to various heresies (particularly monothelitism), and as it relates to the life of Jesus Christ and to Christian salvation history. Helinand divides the whole narrative of Christ's Ascension into three "steps," which are represented by his gifts (prophecy, wisdom, and fear of the Lord, among others), by his miracles (in birth, in preaching, and in death: in the sky, on earth, and over the waters), and by his celestial rule at the right hand of God the Father.¹⁴⁴ Helinand concludes with a declaration of the central message of this sermon on the Assumption when he proclaims: "And thus let us descend so that we may ascend, let us humble ourselves so that we may be exalted, just as the Apostle Peter said, 'humble yourselves under the power of the hand of God so that he might exalt you on the day of his visitation.'"¹⁴⁵

Moving from an exploration of Christian theology into a concentrated section of moral exhortations that draw the sermon to a close, Helinand fashions the descensions and ascensions in the life of Christ into a step-by-step program for the monks to pursue in order to conform their life in imitation of the various stages of Christ's Ascension and so to progress up through the various heights of heaven. Having provided the scheme for ascent into God by interpreting the life of Christ both as a cosmic and as an individualized, internalizable series of events, Helinand concludes his sermon with a series of statements of "this will happen *when*..." based upon life of Christ. For example, Helinand states that "we are transfigured *when* we change our life. The voice of the Father thunders over us *when* we love our enemies and forgive our persecutors, etc."¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 50va, lines 292–309.

¹⁴⁵ "Et nos ergo descendamus ut ascendamus, humiliemur ut exaltemur sicut ait Petrus apostolus, *humiliamini sub potenti manu Dei ut uos exaltet in die uisitacionis* (1 Peter 5:6)" (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 50va, lines 308–309).

¹⁴⁶ "Transfiguramur quando uitam mutamus. Uox Patris super nos intonat quando inimicos diligimus et pro persequentibus exoramus, ..." (Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 50vb–51ra, lines 339–340).

Helinand stresses that his audience is not set apart from the history of salvation, they are an integral part of it. They are living the story of Christ, and they are making their journey heavenward. St Bernard described his monks as former travelers who have become citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, and Helinand cites Paul to the same effect: “at length, the [act of] ascension from heaven into heaven is that of one who comprehends, not that of the wayfarer... so let us act according to the words of the Apostle: ‘our way of life (*conversatio*) is in heaven (Philippians 3:20).’”¹⁴⁷ Helinand leaves his monks to contemplate the “way of life” in heaven. Thus, in effect, Helinand starts his audience in the past, he takes them through the various ways in which history repeats a central, divine message of salvation and ascension (expressed most perfectly in Christ), and he leaves them in the future, at a moment where the cycles of time have ceased and where the travelers have concluded their journey to the city of God.¹⁴⁸

Helinand’s Temple of “living stones” is both eschatologically anticipated as the grand fulfillment of union with God through Christ and presently sought after by monks pursuing perfection. In preparation for the cosmic renewal to come at the conclusion of time, Helinand exhorts each individual monk to pursue virtue and the imitation of Christ and Mary so that they, as “living stones,” might raise up within themselves a Temple to house the Spirit of God, as this internalized sacred space represents the closest possible point of ascension prior to Christ’s return. The monks, in effect, become the bearers of the theophany in their imitation of Mary as the bearer of God.

Helinand’s exegetical project of internalizing elements of sacred space construction for the purpose of ascent into God follows ideas that were developing throughout the twelfth century. Harris, for example, has observed that “for Bernard, the body of the monk as God’s

¹⁴⁷ Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 51ra, lines 350–351.

¹⁴⁸ See Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 51ra–b, lines 351–376.

dwelling place is a building block for the monastery as divine habitation.”¹⁴⁹ This is because the community, as a community, formed the very stones necessary to construct the “heavenly Jerusalem” or the “Temple” on earth. Additionally, Bernard’s friend William of St-Thierry described the liturgical and ritual dimensions of one becoming the Temple of God when he wrote in “On the Nature and the Worth of Love” (*De natura et dignitate amoris*):

He eats and drinks the Body and the Blood of his Redeemer, manna from heaven, the bread of angels, the bread of wisdom; and so eating he is transformed into the nature of the food which he eats. Indeed, to eat the Body of Christ, can it be anything other than to be made the body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit? ... It can receive no inhabitant except God, who built it up and created it.¹⁵⁰

Helinand’s sermon reflects developments of ideas at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Bernard, in particular, as well as William and Aelred focused on the importance of the Cistercian Order as a united community of those who, becoming a Temple of “living stones,” pursue ascent into God.¹⁵¹ Their special interest in communal solidarity during the first half of the twelfth century is understandable in light of the youth of the Order and the challenges faced by organization and reform. Helinand’s sermon does not indicate indifference to communal

¹⁴⁹ Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” 249.

¹⁵⁰ “Manducat et bibit corpus et sanguinem Redemptoris sui, manna caeleste, panem Angelorum, panem sapientiae; et manducans transformatur in naturam cibi quem manducat. Corpus enim Christi manducare, nihil est aliud quam corpus Christi effici, et templum Spiritus sancti? Templum autem hoc cum ornatum fuerit praescriptarum positione virtutum, et supradicto dedicandi ordine dedicatum, nullos ulterius alienos titulos potest suscipere, nullum habitatorem, nisi Deum qui condidit illum et creavit”; William of Saint-Thierry, *De natura et dignitate amoris*, PL 184, col. 403B; also translated in William of Saint-Thierry, *The Nature and Dignity of Love*, trans. Thomas X. Davis, Cistercian Fathers Series 30 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1981), 100. For some additional discussion of this passage, see Harris, “The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages,” 242–243.

¹⁵¹ Caroline Walker Bynum argues that twelfth-century theologians, particularly William of Saint-Thierry and Hugh of Saint Victor, replaced earlier images of the physical body “growing” into the resurrection body with inorganic images, such as rebuilt statues or a reconstructed Temple; see, Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*, Lectures on the History of Religions 15 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 130–136, 224–225.

liturgical events; rather, this sermon, like much of Helinand's other work, *stresses* the theological meanings of these various liturgical occasions in an attempt to direct the life of the monk towards fuller alignment with the life of Christ and with Christ's Ascension in particular.¹⁵² Yet, Helinand preached at a turning point in medieval history, when the power of the cloistered monastery began to wane at the rise in prominence of the universities throughout Europe. Helinand's sermon addresses this changing landscape in a sense because the program for ascent that he presents to his community permits individual monks to pursue ascent into God within themselves should they find themselves outside the sacred walls of the heavenly Jerusalem that was constructed by figures like Bernard at a very different time in history, during the height of monastic power and influence.

BROKEN WALLS: LOOKING AHEAD TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

When the Cistercians began to establish their monastic network at the turn of the twelfth century, their early interests centered primarily on the site and the activity of the cloister. Based upon their interpretation of the *Rule of Benedict*, the monastery was meant to be as self-sufficient as possible, and involvement with the profane world outside of their sacred space was discouraged.¹⁵³ Granted, the reality of the situation was that Cistercians such as Bernard found themselves deeply entrenched in global politics and, even on the local level, Cistercians interacted with surrounding landholders.¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, within the Cistercian autobiographical

¹⁵² For a discussion of Helinand's engagement with Cistercian liturgy, see M. Dumontier, "Hélinand de Froidmont et la liturgie," *Collectanea ordinis cisterciensium reformatorem* 14 (1952): 33–139, 213–215 and 295–300; and M. Dumontier, "Hélinand de Froidmont et la liturgie," *Collectanea ordinis cisterciensium reformatorem* 17 (1955): 49–56 and 118–125.

¹⁵³ See, *Exordium Cistercii* 22–24, in Waddell, *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: Latin Text in Dual Edition with English Translation and Notes*, 412; see also, Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 26.

¹⁵⁴ See Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 5. Also, Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries*, 32; and, Lekai, *The*

narrative relating their monasteries to the “heavenly Jerusalem,” Cistercian monks remained wholly set apart and focused upon ascending the mountain with Christ into God. In terms of preaching, Martha Newman has observed that the Cistercians rarely inclined to address the laity; however, the threat of Catharism in the south of France during the late twelfth century (until about the fourteenth century) proved to be a matter of exception.¹⁵⁵

To say that Cistercian preaching to the laity (exclusive of the growing ranks of lay brothers) in the twelfth century was exceptional would be over-reaching in its claim, but one may observe that, in terms of vocation, Christians outside of the regular brethren were not the Cistercian preachers’ primary concern.¹⁵⁶ From the occasional lay sermons that remain available for consultation, it becomes clear that, while preachers tended not to advocate the monastic life of perfection in liminality to the masses, the influence of Bernardine and Cistercian views of history and eschatology persisted even when preaching outside of the cloister. For example, a sermon preached at Montpellier by an “abbot of Cîteaux” (*abbas cisterciensis*), perhaps the infamous Arnaud Amaury (d. 1225), warned against damnation and advocated penance, obedience, and humility, concluding that these things grant access to “the kingdom where Christ is king and his mother queen, where the angels are knights and the saints citizens.”¹⁵⁷ This abbot

Cistercians, 65–68. Pope Alexander III admonished the Order for secular engagements in 1169; see Jean Leclercq, “Passage supprimé dans une épître d’Alexandre III,” *Revue bénédictine* 62 (1952): 149–151; see also, Kienzle, “The House of the Lord: Hélinand on Superfluous Monastic Construction,” 135.

¹⁵⁵ Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 187. For further discussion by Newman of Cistercian disinterest in those outside of the cloister, see *Ibid.*, 300, n. 78.

¹⁵⁶ Kienzle explores the occasions and the reasons for which the white monks left their cloisters to preach against heretics contrary to their monastic vocation in Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*.

¹⁵⁷ “Aspiremus igitur ad id regnum ubi rex est Christus, ubi regina matri eius, ubi angeli milites, ubi sancti cives” (B.N. lat. 14859, f. 234ra); quoted and discussed by Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, 188f. For a discussion of the possible author of this sermon, see *Ibid.*, 330, n. 79. For more on the figure of Arnaud Amaury, see Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 138–161.

of Cîteaux spoke to his audience using the commonly held vernacular of crusading and of kingdoms. The knights and sainted citizens of heaven, united under a king and queen, maintain the longstanding societal paradigms of the *bellatores* and *oratores*, while the more proximate vocabulary of crusade draws the preacher and his audience into a shared arena of experience. The laity, of course, have not yet reached the “kingdom where Christ is king” and they are not, like their preacher, “citizens among the saints and members among the household of God,” but they may still find themselves on a more secure path by following orthodox Catholic Christianity and by rejecting Catharism.¹⁵⁸

The successes of the First Crusade, mixed with the Bernard’s involvement in the Second Crusade, planted a seed of crusader interest within the hearts and the minds of the Cistercian Order. Indeed, one might even say that the Cistercian Order had crusading motives inherent to its very foundation, as Robert’s exodus was the product of a time of vibrant intellectual and theological reform, enthusiastic pilgrimage, and pervasive crusading ideals. Bernard’s dismay at the failure of the Second Crusade and at the gross misconduct, utter lack of knightly decorum, and egregious sinfulness shown by the knights in their massacres of Rhineland Jewish communities remained insufficient to temper Cistercian interest in the recapture of the Holy Land.¹⁵⁹ The strong Cistercian interest in crusade was strangely ambivalent, however. As Lekai has observed, “although the General Chapter repeatedly forbade pilgrimage to the holy places for the members of the Order, the organization of the Third Crusade (1184–1192) was largely the

¹⁵⁸ For an exploration of Cistercian involvement with Catharism, see especially Kienzle’s discussion of “Weeding the Vineyard” in Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 135–173.

¹⁵⁹ For a detailed consideration of the Second Crusade, its failures, anti-Jewish polemics and attacks, and the aftermath of this debacle for Bernard, see Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 43–61.

work of Cistercian prelates who had the moral backing of the whole Order.”¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, by the time of the Fourth Crusade (1198–1216), the General Chapter both provided funds and released monks and abbots to engage in the crusading cause at the urging of Innocent III (1160–1216).¹⁶¹ Perhaps the growing anxiety felt in Western Europe that the Holy Land in general, and Jerusalem in particular, may have been lost for good to enemy forces was strong enough to penetrate the holy walls of the cloister. In Europe, Cistercian legate Peter of Castelnau’s assassination on January 15, 1208, likely by an agent of Count Raymond of Toulouse (1156–1222), certainly breached monastic barriers and directed Cistercian interest towards Occitania.¹⁶²

The need for Cistercian involvement outside of their cloistered sacred space was problematic during the thirteenth century due to its increasing frequency, but it was not a novel issue with which the Cistercian community had to deal. Lekai notes that, even in the twelfth century, the Cistercian monks proved to be an effective “professional staff which could be relied upon as needs or emergencies arose.”¹⁶³ Keen on their solitude, but never too antagonistic to the ecclesiastical hierarchy (especially to the papacy), which tended to afford them a wide berth, the Cistercians maintained a certain degree of political and social power and influence within western Christian society. As Lekai observes, “that such a role was not easily compatible with the ideals of early Cîteaux was well evident; on the other hand, the tight organization, ubiquitous

¹⁶⁰ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 53.

¹⁶¹ Innocent III sent a letter to the Cistercian General Chapter in 1198, and he sent his legate Fulk of Neuilly to recruit Cistercian preachers as well. By 1201, Fulk was granted Chapter authority to choose three abbots to assist him. See, Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 80–93. For the text of Innocent III’s letter, see D. Josephus M. Canivez, ed., *Statuta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786, I (1116–1220)*, Bibliothèque de la Revue d’hist. eccl. 9 (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1933), 221–224.

¹⁶² See Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*, 101–104; and Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 136, 150–151.

¹⁶³ Lekai continues: “That is why Church authorities welcomed the assistance of Saint Bernard and his monks, and continued to call primarily upon Cistercians, at least until the emergence of the Mendicants early in the thirteenth century”; Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 52.

presence and overflowing membership that included some of the best and most active minds of the century predestined Cistercians to step into the vacuum and assume a variety of external duties.”¹⁶⁴ This tension, part of which Lekai considers the dichotomy between “ideals” and “reality,” rose to greater prominence during the first few decades of the thirteenth century.

Louis Lekai has argued that ecclesiastical history during the thirteenth century exhibited both the “fail[ure] to materialize” the “Gregorian expectations of a world governed by Christian principles” and “a climax of unprecedented moral and political power” with the reign of Innocent III.¹⁶⁵ Within this mélange of successes and failures, Lekai observed:

The attempt to form a Christian commonwealth out of the emerging nations of Europe fell short of its goal, yet the Crusades attested to the power of common ideals and to the will for united action. The growth of individual piety, the restless search for truth and beauty led to the renewal of mysticism and to matchless originality in poetry and art.¹⁶⁶

The Fourth Crusade, which inaugurated the thirteenth century, set the tumultuous stage as the first years of the century delivered a profound blow against any “lofty ideals” held by western Christian monks, clerics, mystics, or other spiritually minded ideologues. Described by Lekai as a “shameful debacle,” the Fourth Crusade was initially intended the recapture Jerusalem, which had been lost to Salah al-Din on September 29, 1187 (this event being one of the major reasons for the Third Crusade from 1187–1192).¹⁶⁷ Rather than marching on Jerusalem, however, the crusading knights diverted their attention to Constantinople, where they sacked the city and ensured the lasting gulf between Eastern and Western Christians known as the “Great Schism.”

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 77.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 78.

While crusaders in the East were wreaking havoc in Christian lands, crusaders in the south of France were seeking to eliminate the heresy of Catharism in decidedly less-than-Christian ways. Cistercians, such as Arnaud Amaury and Guy of les Vaux-de-Cernay, provided spiritual backing to lay leaders such as Simon of Montfort, who were pursuing interests of power and control with hardly pure motives.¹⁶⁸ During the period of the Albigensian Crusade (1209–1229), thousands were killed as heretics in the name of God.¹⁶⁹ Arnaud Amaury is a uniquely dark figure in Cistercian history, but the fact that he could act with such impunity, in ways so seemingly opposed to the early vision of the Cistercians while serving as abbot of Cîteaux (elected 1200), is troubling indeed. As Kienzle observes: “Arnaud Amaury demonstrated the worst of Cîteaux, an appalling contradiction of monastic spirituality and its ideals of humility, prayer, and contemplation.”¹⁷⁰ Nevertheless his presence, among other Cistercians preaching against heresy, hints at fractures in the edifice of thirteenth-century Cistercian spirituality.

From the point of view of a Cistercian monk not embroiled in crusader intrigue, Lekai observed:

That Cistercian abbeys in their rural isolation and rustic simplicity no longer stood in the forefront of thirteenth-century developments is a matter of foregone conclusion. The Dominicans were better adapted to serve the Church as missionaries and theologians; the Franciscans more effectively conveyed the message of poverty to the urban masses; the professionally educated secular clergy or laity could easily replace Cistercians as royal or papal advisors and negotiators. More important, the best religious vocations joined the Mendicants rather than the old monastic orders and even lay brothers found more rewarding employment in the city convents of the new orders than in Cistercian granges.¹⁷¹

Lekai presents a rather bleak picture of Cistercian prospects just one hundred years after the foundation of the Order, but Cistercian monasticism endured by adapting to the societal

¹⁶⁸ For a discussion of Guy, see Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229*, 161–165.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 154–161.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 161.

¹⁷¹ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, 78f.

changes and the new challenges ushered in by the turn of the century. In Helinand's sermon on the Assumption, for instance, Helinand maintained close intellectual and exegetical connections with formative Cistercian thinkers such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Aelred of Rievaulx, but he also adapted his preaching by constructing a sacred Temple-space for the pursuit of ascent into God that utilized temporal and material metaphors which would not require one's physical presence within the Cistercian cloister in order to function.

Perhaps the most important exegetical bridge for a "textual community," whether it be the subset of a population—such as the Cistercian Order—or a population as a whole—such as all of western Christendom—is the bridge that spans the interpretive gaps between historical time, present time, and eschatological "time," or salvation history. Indeed, this may be the very foundation for exegetical thought. Helinand described his brethren as the building materials necessary to construct the Temple of "living stones" that Christ shall build at the end of ages, a superior structure to the Temple of Solomon and a lasting testament to the reorganization of the world with Christ as the head and the Church as his body. This future Temple is yet-to-be realized, but it is always anticipated by those remaining in historical time. To monks living in the present time, Helinand preached a particular theological anthropology wherein each monk maintained a Temple within himself so that the actions that the brother performs in his daily life may reflect the historical actions of the priest fulfilling his duties within the Temple precincts.

The monks of Cluny created their architectures of sacred space by grounding sacrality within the physical structures of the monastic cloister and in the material culture at Cluny. The early Cistercians shifted the creation and maintenance of sacred space into an exegetical construction of the members within a sacred community. Now, it appears that the sacred pivot linking heaven and earth has begun to move once more as the sacred bridge moves inward,

connecting the souls of the monks to each other and to God. Thus, each brother represents a sacred microcosm, a sacred temple tended by a priestly soul in pursuit of its ascent into God and its reunion with the other saints as “citizens” and as “living stones” which comprise the Temple-Church of Christ in its final, timeless form.

FROM *CIVIS* TO *VIATOR*, FINDING STABILITY WHILE WANDERING

I argue that ideas of interiorized sacred space construction among Cistercian exegetes, such as those that I am identifying in Helinand’s sermons, represent a practical response to changing societal needs. The Cistercian General Chapter was aware of the need for its congregations to adapt to a religious landscape increasingly dominated both by mendicant orders, such as the Dominicans and Franciscans, and by secular and monastic clerics studying at the great new institution of the thirteenth century, the university. For the Cistercian Order to remain relevant in the thirteenth century, its monks had to leave their cloister to establish a presence as preachers and as university scholars, but these pursuits directly contravene both the letter and the spirit of the Cistercian autobiographical account found in the “Primitive Documents.”

The early Cistercian founders identified themselves in opposition to and in supersession of Benedictine houses such as Cluny under the general argument that they, as the *novum monasterium*, were returning to the *Rule of Benedict* with greater vigor, thus fulfilling its holy precepts with greater care, and therefore more fittingly understood as “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God,” as their *conversatio* more closely resembled that “way of life” established by Christ, his Apostles, Benedict, and his monks. Cistercian monasticism, founded on the notion of following the *Rule of Benedict* “to the letter,” is *prima facie* incompatible with either the image of the “wandering monk” or the notion of external,

secularized study. Yet, in order to respond to societal pressures, increasing numbers of Cistercians found themselves outside of their cloister and living in a manner that was in literal contradistinction to the three Benedictine vows of obedience, *conversatio morum*, and stability, as no monk could fulfill the literal sense of Benedictine vows while wandering about the countryside preaching to the laity or while studying abroad at the university.¹⁷² Matthew Paris, a Benedictine monk living in the first half of the thirteenth century, observes the visible outcome of this tension:

Cistercians, in order to avoid the contempt of Dominicans, Franciscans and erudite seculars, particularly lawyers and canonists ... obtained houses in Paris and elsewhere where schools flourished, then they established their own schools where they could study with more devotion theology, canon and [Roman] law, because they did not wish to look inferior to others.¹⁷³

Seemingly without their foundational traditions to tether their Order to the arc of salvation history, the Cistercian monks had to define new modes of exegetical engagement to allow their

¹⁷² The problems raised by, for example, the establishment of the College of Saint Bernard in Paris between 1245 and 1255 under the guidance of Stephen Lexington, Abbot of Clairvaux beginning in December 1243, represents the considerable tension felt within the Cistercian General Chapter. Silent in 1254 when the College was granted papal privileges by Innocent IV, the General Chapter deposed Stephen in 1255. Nevertheless, over the subsequent decades, the Cistercians established *studia* for their monks at the major centers of learning throughout Europe; see, *Ibid.*, 81–83; see also, Colette Obert-Piketty, “Benoît XII et les collèges cisterciens du Languedoc,” in *Les Cisterciens de Languedoc (XIII-XIV siècle)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 21, 1986, 139–150. Michael Davis makes an interesting argument regarding the church at the *Collège Saint-Bernard*. A number of scholars argue that its expansion in the fourteenth-century expansion manifests the Cistercians’ loss of their earlier ideals; rather than seeing the church as an example of the “comfortable decadence of an Order that had long since slipped the traces of its original ideals of spiritual rigour and aesthetic austerity,” Davis examines the church as an instance of the “stylistic fluidity of the Order’s architecture that endowed its studied simplicity with rich and varied complexity”; see Michael T. Davis, “Cistercians in the City: The Church of the Collège Saint-Bernard in Paris,” in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honor of Peter Fergusson*, ed. Terryl N. Kinder and Peter Fergusson, *Medieval Church Studies* 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 223–234, here 224.

¹⁷³ Quoted and translated by Lekai in *The Cistercians*, 79. Following his quotation of Matthew, Lekai observes: “The chronicler had some reservations about the trend among monastic orders and reminded them that the author of their Rule, Saint Benedict, had abandoned the schools of Rome to retire to the desert. Yet, he did not blame the orders, but the corrupting influence of a world that no longer respected monastic simplicity”; *Ibid.*

“textual community” to persist in its established purpose of ascension even as these monks sought to find their place within the landscape of thirteenth-century religious movements.

Helinand’s exegetical maneuver, which located at least a spiritual simulacrum of the Temple within the body and the thought-world of each Cistercian monk engaged in the common pursuit of ascent into God, offered some consolation to members of the Cistercian Order in principle if not in deed. By maintaining the Temple of Christ within oneself, each monk remained capable of fulfilling the vows that were central to his place in the broader paradigms of salvation: the monk could remain obedient because Christ remained with him always whenever his abbot may not be nearby; he could keep his “way of life,” for each action that he took, spiritually understood, contributed to the Temple, as a priest in service of the altar; and he could remain stable because he stood always grounded in the Temple within which he both served and acted as material support. Is this way of thinking optimal when compared to the historically established Cistercian ideals? Surely it is not. Yet, this kind of exegetical maneuver did permit the members of the Cistercian textual community to retain their ideological and theological integrity in response to prevailing societal demands, and I suspect that such an interpretive project, whether desired or not, became necessary for the Cistercians to remain “Cistercian” past the twelfth century. Shifting the site of sacred space inward as a spiritual Temple, while maintaining exegetical bonds of brotherhood that united the “living stones” of the textual community to Christ, “the cornerstone,” permitted thirteenth-century Cistercian monks to join their twelfth-century brothers as “citizens among the saints and members of the household of God.” Thus, as true citizens of “Jerusalem” wherever they might wander, these monks remained able to follow Christ as he led them and so ascend into God.

Conclusion

Be You as Living Stones Built Up, A Spiritual House, A Holy Priesthood

I saw a new heaven and a new earth. Thus the first heaven and the first earth passed away, and the sea is no longer. And I, John, saw the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, descending from heaven from God, having been prepared like a bride dressed for her husband.... But I did not see a Temple within her, for the Lord, God Almighty, is her Temple, and the Lamb.¹

At its most fundamental level, this project has sought to understand more fully observations made by historians of medieval European religious history that twelfth-century Christians, or twelfth-century monks more specifically, or twelfth-century Cistercian monks more precisely still, were devoted to and focused upon the “heavenly Jerusalem.” As Jean Leclercq, who has cast a long and influential shadow across scholarship on medieval monastic spirituality, notably observed, the monastic cloister represented a “‘Jerusalem in anticipation,’ a foretaste of Heaven [that] gives direction and also its form to the monk’s culture and theology. Because it belongs to the eschatological order—anticipated but still imperfect participation in the sight of God—contemplation [of it] is essentially an act of faith, hope, and love.”²

The purpose of this project was not to overturn any long-held perception of this medieval “truth” within the academy. Indeed, it does appear that the idea of “Jerusalem” both in its earthly incarnation and in its heavenly anticipation preoccupied the minds of some of the greatest

¹ “Et vidi caelum novum et terram novam. Primum enim caelum, et prima terra abiit, et mare jam non est. Et ego Joannes vidi sanctam civitatem Jerusalem novam descendentem de caelo a Deo, paratam sicut sponsam ornatam viro suo. ... Et templum non vidi in ea: Dominus enim Deus omnipotens templum illius est, et Agnus” (Revelation 21:1–2, 22). The idea of the sea being “no longer” is an indicator that, in this time of eschatological renewal, God has performed the ultimate triumph over the forces of chaos. For a discussion of water as a metaphor for chaos, see Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 14–33, esp. 33.

² Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 67.

theologians and exegetes of medieval western Christian society during the period known as the high Middle Ages. Historians possess a wealth of primary source material from medieval theologians, who wrote about the holy city; from medieval scholars, who investigated the holy city; from medieval preachers, who preached about the holy city; and from medieval monks, who meditated upon, and dwelt within, their version of the holy city. What contemporary historians do not have is a sustained account as to why “Jerusalem” might have proven so valuable to western Europeans that they would depict it as the “center of the world.”

The argument that I have sustained throughout this investigation is a simple one: monastic exegeses related to ideas such as the “kingdom of God,” the “heavenly Jerusalem,” and the “Temple,” which were meant to render a profane space sacred, found expression within embedded historical contexts, and they appeared in order to identify and to create a bridge between a religious community and the ultimate object of its devotion, God. The interpretation of scripture represents a complex act of negotiation and arbitration among three realities—first, the historical, political, and theological contexts within which the scriptures were composed (both through the process of writing and through the process of redaction); second, the historical, political, theological, and traditional contexts within which the exegete undertakes the act of interpretation; and finally, the eschatological event horizon, which is steadily and inescapably drawing the passage of time to its conclusion, towards which the textual community aspires. The necessity to establish, to map out, and to direct oneself and one’s community along the pathway leading to salvation encapsulates the central challenge of the religious interpreter, for this trajectory guides the meaning of life in this world and in the world to come. For the Cistercians of the twelfth century, their need to affirm their community as the right and just inheritors of the apostolic life of Christ’s closest companions drove their intellectual actions and thought

constructions as they built up and interpreted a “text” designed to pursue the central goal of ascent into God.

Stepping back in time from the twelfth century in order to investigate exegetical and institutional precedents that may have influenced Cistercian interest in and development of the biblical concept of the “heavenly Jerusalem,” our first point of inquiry was Cluny, as the monks of Cluny held the unenviable position of being the straw men against whom the early Cistercian reformers identified themselves. In the first chapter, I considered two major questions: what might it have meant to the monks of Cluny to describe their monastic project as the realization of the “kingdom of God”; and what are the processes through which these monks identified their physical monastic space as “sacred space”? I argued that the idea of the “kingdom of God” lies at the very core of Christianity. Appearing both in the teachings of Jesus and in the words of Paul, the notion of the “kingdom” is grounded in the Hebrew Bible, reinterpreted and reconfigured by the actors of the New Testament, and remains a central object of interpretation and concern through the Middle Ages up to the present day.

The monks of Cluny identified their cloister as a sacred space wherein the power of God irrupted into the world and within which they, as the *oratores* who prayed on behalf of their broader Christian community, could be most effective. These monks described themselves as members of the heavenly choir who straddled the boundary between the human world and the heavenly domain of God. As those who dwelt at the threshold of God’s kingdom, they were deemed uniquely suited to intercede on behalf of Christian souls, both living and dead, during a period of great upheaval and social unrest. Their strict organization of monastic priories and their ostensible accumulation of wealth served as more than mere analogues for divine favor, these elements of Cluniac spirituality were central aspects of the Cluniac program of perpetual

praise (*laus perennis*). Christians outside of their cloisters were drawn to Cluny for pilgrimage and for guidance because they trusted the efficacy of the monks' prayers that they saw manifest in the glorious appearance of the "kingdom of God" established and maintained by these prayerful black monks with their physically-constructed sacred bridge. These monks sought to show an unsettled society preoccupied with sin that God's favor remained upon the earth.

The foundation of the Cistercian Order at the very end of the eleventh century came as the direct and specific opposition to the "excesses" of Benedictine monks, such as those of Cluny. Robert, founder and first abbot of the reformed Benedictine monastery of Molesme, left his monastery, along with a small group of "apostles," in order to found a monastic institution that "more perfectly" followed the *Rule of Benedict*. The objects of contention for these reform-minded monks were several, but the primary elements of discord concerned the accumulation of wealth and the proper daily conduct of the monastic life (*conversatio*). Specifically, the founders of Cîteaux felt that Benedictine monasteries, even certain "reforming monasteries" such as Molesme, focused too greatly upon the accumulation of worldly goods in place of spiritual "goods" and virtues. They felt that the daily expression of the monastic vocation must return to the moderate liturgy and to the undertaking of manual labor prescribed by the *Rule*; they argued that the monastic *conversatio* must imitate more completely the austere life of Christ and his Apostles. Their 1098 exodus into "places of horror and vast wilderness" was by no means a matter of *sui generis* reform, however.

The early Cistercian program of reform was inspired from a number of sources within the context of medieval European society. These sources included, most notably, an ongoing series of ecclesiastical reforms (sometimes simply called the "Gregorian Reforms"); the developing concept of living the "apostolic life" (*vita apostolica*) as depicted in the Acts community by

living in poverty, in austerity, and in *communitas*; and the chivalric ideals of knighthood coupled with the drive towards a more personalized, and interiorized, struggle for holiness made most evident by the spirit of crusade. Developing within a historical context of changing political, social, and theological categories, the *ordo cisterciensis* undertook to construct a new kind of monastic space, one which best exemplified and best manifested the moral and spiritual ideals emerging within a transforming society. In the second chapter of this study, I focused upon the actions of a singular Cistercian exegete, Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, who sought both to unite his newly developing monastic “Order” to the whole of orthodox Christian tradition leading back to Christ and to his Apostles and to locate this new order within the trajectory of Christian salvation history in order to exalt the principles of his order in light of, and sometimes in spite of, its historical reality.

As with the first chapter, this second chapter endeavored to answer two related questions: first, how did Bernard’s exegetical thought, which heavily influenced and contributed to the “text” of the Cistercian “textual community,” unite the Cistercian Order to the soteriological “kingdom of heaven”; and second, what did Bernard mean in terms of the exegetical construction of sacred space when he identified his monastery as the “heavenly Jerusalem”? In the first chapter, I discussed various elements of interpretive precedent leading to the prominence of the “heavenly Jerusalem” in twelfth-century exegetical thought; in this chapter, I discussed ways in which the “heavenly Jerusalem” served a central purpose in early Cistercian practice. Exploring some of Bernard’s writings made it clear why Jean Leclercq, who edited Bernard’s multi-volume corpus, would conclude that monastic spirituality during the high Middle Ages was preoccupied with the idea(l) of the “heavenly Jerusalem” in much the same way the Le Goff had argued that “sin” governed the minds of early medieval western Christians. Bernard’s

concept of the “heavenly Jerusalem” featured significantly in Bernard’s mystical theology and remained central to his idea of the importance of Christ’s Ascension and the Cistercian practice of ascending into God.

From investigating Bernard’s exegetical works, both those texts initially directed to individuals outside of the cloister and those whose primary audience was members within the Cistercian “textual community,” I offered four observations: first, Bernard’s portrayal of the ideal of the “heavenly Jerusalem” remains consistent regardless of the audience, and, in this regard, it is important to note that Bernard’s message appears *intelligible* both to “insiders” and to “outsiders.” Second, Bernard’s notion of the “heavenly Jerusalem” is better understood as a theology of “heavenly Jerusalemites,” as his primary focus is always the members of his community rather than a physical space termed “Jerusalem.” Third, Bernard’s “heavenly Jerusalem” represents a sacred space that is exegetically constructed and ontologically dependent upon the web of relations established by the members of the “textual community” in their sharing of a common “text” that dictates and establishes actions and interactions in accordance to commonly-held interpretations and expectations of reality and soteriology. Finally, the purpose of the “heavenly Jerusalem,” as an exegetically-constructed sacred space identified with the cloister without dependence upon physical constructs, is intended to facilitate the Cistercian practice of ascent into God.

As we saw at Cluny, the Cistercian monastery was regarded as a sacred space that formed a bridge between heaven and earth and that created a liminal island betwixt and between the realms of the sacred and of the profane; however, unlike Cluny, Bernard’s conceptualization of sacred space regarded ascension as the object of its creation and identification (in contrast to purgation). Bernard focused upon the individual monk’s journey into God by way of communal

support in contrast to the Cluniac configuration of an elite enclave of monks engaged in spiritual warfare on behalf of the general Christian community. Bernard's exegetical thought developed out of the historical and intellectual context of high medieval reforms in such a way that Bernard was able to take an ancient and persistent concept, namely the idea of the "kingdom of God," and transform it into a program of interiorized and individualized ascent into God (conducted within an exteriorized and communal space). This conceptualization reflected prevailing societal interests such as the *vita apostolica*, personalized spirituality, pilgrim sanctity, and crusade. Bernard of Clairvaux may have been the most influential man of the twelfth century for the medieval Latin West, but the influence of one man is limited if others do not share his vision. In Chapter Three, I examined two additional Cistercian exegetes of the twelfth and early-thirteenth century—Aelred of Rievaulx and Helinand of Froidmont—in order both to demonstrate that exegetical, rather than physical, sacred space construction featured in medieval Cistercian spirituality and to show various ways in which Cistercians created a sacred space as a locus for practices of ascent.

The first part of Chapter Three examined Aelred's exegetical topos of "mud bricks" and "living stones" as elements used by Aelred both to designate varying degrees of holiness to various human groups and to construct a Jerusalem of "bricks" and "stones" that served as a spatial metaphor for spiritual action. Here I observed that spatial metaphors may be extended outside of their physical dimensions in order to discuss the presence or absence of sanctity within a community, which is in some ways the reverse of the process that we saw leading from Cluniac ideas of space made sacred by material objects to Bernard's ideas of space made sacred by holy communal pursuits. Aelred's presentation of the city of Jerusalem and its Temple as a kind of tiered model of increasing holiness, with those seeking ascension or "perfection" residing as

contemplatores within the Temple, resembled Bernard's depiction of the monastic community as a "heavenly Jerusalem," but Aelred modified the spatial metaphor somewhat in his explication. Aelred's "living stones" were conceptually similar to Bernard's "Jerusalemites," his "citizens among the saints and members of the household of God," but Aelred expanded the exegetical city to extend from heaven to earth such that the Jerusalem itself became a microcosm and an analogue for the pursuit of ascent. Through the courts, past the gates, and into the Temple, joining together with other "living stones" and leaving behind fallen "muddy bricks," Aelred taught his community to rise up like a "sweet smelling savor" in the Temple of Jerusalem to the nostrils of God.³

The final exegete considered for this project, Helinand of Froidmont, who lived and preached at the turn of the century, drew upon Bernard and Aelred in his exegetical thought, and his sermons provide some indication of the manner in which exegetical sacred space construction might have proved useful to the Cistercian community as they adapted to changing historical circumstances. By discussing a previously unedited sermon on the Assumption of Mary, I sought to demonstrate that Helinand used ideas from Bernard and Aelred but that he explored the idea of Cistercian ascent into God somewhat differently. Whereas Bernard and Aelred both focused on intracommunal relations as central to the success of the "citizens" or the "stones" as they, "having been built together, ascend into a holy Temple in the Lord" (Ephesians 2:22), Helinand employed temporal, material, and spatial metaphors to investigate the individual monk's connection to Christ and to Mary through imitation in order to ground the pursuit of

³ Cf. 2 Corinthians 2:15, "For we are to God the good odor of Christ among them who are saved and them who perish" (*quia Christi bonus odor sumus Deo in his qui salvi fiunt et in his qui pereunt*) and Ephesians 5:2, "Walk in love, as Christ also has loved us and handed himself over for our sakes, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor" (*et ambulate in dilectione sicut et Christus dilexit nos et tradidit se ipsum pro nobis oblationem et hostiam Deo in odorem suavitatis*).

ascent within the monk's own body, which serves as a Temple and as a microcosm of Christian salvation history.

It was not the case that the community lacked importance for Helinand; rather, he urged the brethren to embody past exemplars taught in the scriptures and to perform present priestly actions prescribed by the *Rule* in order to ascend like Christ into God and to merit an individual future among the "living stones dedicated as a Temple to the living God." I hypothesized that Helinand's presentation of the Temple, as a potentially interiorized sacred space, may provide the monks of the Cistercian community one interpretive method for maintaining a connection to their monastic community should they discover themselves outside of their sacred cloister due to an increasing number of historical circumstances that made the boundary walls between the sacred monastery and the profane world more permeable.

In concluding this project on Cistercian exegeses, the creation of sacred space and the pursuit of ascension, it seems best to end where this project began. Many students, in universities across the world, are taught that monastic spirituality during the high Middle Ages held especial regard for the "heavenly Jerusalem." This, it would appear, is quite true, and there presents no reason to challenge this element of the historical curriculum. The historical and exegetical contexts within which the "heavenly Jerusalem" rose in prominence to the seat of preoccupation, however, present fascinating avenues for research into how and why religious interpreters make use of Scripture and tradition in order to unite their communities to the central narratives of their religion. In order to bind themselves and their *novum monasterium* to the arc of Christian salvation history, in order to ensure that their members would feature as the "living stones built up" into the New Jerusalem that endures the eschatological passing of time, Cistercian exegetes during the twelfth century employed all of their powers of exegetical

interpretation to transform the simple walls of their monasteries into the vision and the anticipation of the “heavenly Jerusalem” and, within that vision, they called their monks to “be as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood.”

Appendix I:

Helinand of Froidmont's Sermon on the Assumption of Mary

The sermon presented below represents one of sixty-nine extant sermons attributed to the Cistercian preacher and exegete, Helinand of Froidmont (c. 1160–1237). Two manuscripts are known to contain Helinand's sermons, Bibliothèque Mazarine 1041 and Bibliothèque nationale de France Lat. 14591. Today housed in Parisian libraries, the earliest known location of these two books—and perhaps the location at which either they were written or they were bound—was just outside of medieval Paris in the library of the Augustinian Abbey of St Victor. The library records of St Victor begin in 1514 when the librarian of the abbey, Claude de Grandrue, compiled a catalogue of the holdings of the monastery in anticipation of a massive reorganization of the library.¹ Thanks to the extensive research of scholars such as Gilbert Ouy, much has been written about the library of St. Victor. Most importantly, Claude de Grandrue's original catalogue (still held at the BnF Salle de Manuscrits) has been edited and published with additional notes and concordances for ease of reference.² Based upon de Grandrue's organization of the library, Bibliothèque nationale de France 14591 and Bibliothèque Mazarine 1041 would have been located at RR.3. and RR.5., respectively. The double letter indicates, generally, works of patristic and Cistercian theology; RR catalogues sermon manuscripts specifically.³

Bibliothèque Mazarine 1041, which contains the only witness to this sermon, is a composite manuscript containing an early-fourteenth-century copy of some of Helinand's sermons (f. 1–96, the final sermon is incomplete); a thirteenth-century text of glosses on a legal *decretum*;

¹ Richard H. Rouse, "Gilbert Ouy, Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: Catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)," *Speculum* 77, no. 3 (July 2002): 962–963.

² G. Ouy, *Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*, 2 vols., Bibliotheca Victorina 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999).

³ *Ibid.*, I: 52f.

and a late-thirteenth-century copy of Benencasa's *Casus decretorum*. The manuscript is about 215 millimeters by 315 millimeters in size, is foliated in ink both by Claude de Grandrue and by another, unknown foliator, and it presents a variable number of columns depending upon the text (Helinand's sermons are in two columns). The binding, which is original to the fourteenth century, is white sheepskin stretched over wooded (likely oak) boards. There is evidence that the book was once chained while it resided in the library of St Victor. This sermon collection is unedited (with only partial correspondence to Migne, *PL* 212) and is incomplete.⁴ BnF Lat. 14591 is likewise unedited and incomplete, and these two manuscripts do not contain overlapping sermons. Helinand's sermons were identified as such by Johannes Baptist Schneyer in his *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150–1350, Auctoren: E–H*, (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen), Band 43, Heft 2, 1970, p. 617–622.

I have sought to keep editorial interference within the text modest. I have only “corrected” the text where it was warranted either by an existing scribal emendation or by a clear mistake in reproducing material for which a known source text exists. Occasions where correction was necessary because the recorded Latin made poor grammatical sense or was nonsense have been noted accordingly. Orthography in the manuscript has been maintained in the edition below. The scribes of Bib. Maz. 1041 distinguish regularly between the unassibilated ‘ti’ sound—written ‘ti’—and the assibilated ‘ti’ sound—written ‘ci’. ‘U’ and ‘v’ have been represented by the letter ‘u’. Latin diphthongs such as ‘ae’ tend to be written as a simple ‘e’—for example, ‘hec’ for ‘haec’—although this is not the case for every expected instance. The manuscript is punctuated; however, the original punctuation was designed to stress key phrases, likely for the purposes of

⁴ G. Ouy lists this manuscript in his “Index des manuscrits mutilés” for missing the catchword (*ad pristinum statum*); *Ibid.*, I: 395.

oral delivery, perhaps for *lectio divina*. Thus, I have imposed punctuation on the text according to *CCCM* guidelines and with the intention of aiding the reader in construing complex clauses. By repunctuating the text, I have attempted to limit ambiguities while clearing away cases of confusing, or incorrect, punctuation. The apparatus follows standard *CCCM* style.

In this particular sermon, which Helinand likely preached on the Feast of the Assumption of Mary in the middle of August, Helinand exhorts his brethren to imitate both Christ and his mother Mary, the patroness of the Cistercian Order, in both of their actions of ascent into God. Following Christ and Mary as exemplars, Helinand connects the life of the monk to the lives of Christ and Mary in order to show how biblical time informs and manifests itself during the course of the liturgical year. By virtue of this observation, Helinand presents a program of ascent for his community so that they might endeavor to “become like God” by following in the path of Christ, uniting themselves as the body to its head, and by building themselves up as “living stones” into a Temple worthy of Christ, who shall build and perfect the Temple of God at the end of time.

In Eodem Sermo¹

48ra

In diebus illis, *congregati sunt omnes maiores natu Israel, et principes tribuum, ac duces familiarum ad regem Salomonem, ut deferrent archam federis Domini de ciuitate Dauid; hoc est, de Syon.*² *Et intulerunt eam sacerdotes in Ierusalem, in locum suum, in oraculum templi, in sanctum sanctorum, subter alas cherubin.*³ Hoc est dicere, “assumpta est Maria in celum, gaudent angeli, laudantes benedicent Dominum.”⁴ Salomon Christus; archa Maria; sacerdotes uel seniores angeli; oraculum templi sublimissima pars empirei celi. Singule partes huius expositionis latius explicande sunt.

Salomon interpretatur ‘*pacificus*’⁵; hic est Christus qui est *pax nostra qui fecit utraque unum*⁶ qui *per sanguinem suum pacificauit que in celis sunt et que in terra*⁷ in se reconcilians una summis homines Deo et angelis et gentes Iudeis⁸ qui *annunciauit pacem hiis qui longe et hiis qui prope.*⁹ Salomon habuit pacem temporis, Christus attulit pacem peccatoris et eternitatis pacem promisit, dicens: “*pacem relinquo uobis, pacem meam do uobis.*”¹⁰ Hic relinquo, illic do; sequentibus relinquo, peruenientibus do.”¹¹ Ergo plusquam Salomon hic.

Salomon per septenne spacium edificauit templum pernobile et in toto orbe nominatissimum et octauo dedicauit. Christus per septem etates huius mundi edificat ecclesiam de lapidibus uiuis. In templum Dei uiui dedicaturus eadem octaua cuius edificatio sanctificatio est in tempore, dedicatio glorificatio in eternitate. Ergo plusquam Salomon hic.

Salomon tribus desiderabilibus — id est sapientia, diuiciis, et gloria — pre cunctis mortalibus habundauit. *Christus est Dei uirtus et Dei sapientia*¹² *in eo sunt omnes thesauri sapientie et*

¹ Lege, “In assumptione beatae mariae uirginis,” (cf. Bib. Maz. 1041, f. 45ra)

² congregati – Syon] III Reg. 8, 1

³ et intulerunt – cherubin] III Reg. 8, 6

⁴ assumpta – Dominum] “Assumpta est Maria in caelum,” Antiphona in modo 7, (Liber Usualis, No. 1606)

⁵ Salomon... *pacificus*] HIERONYMUS, *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* – ed. Lagarde (CC SL, 72), 1959, p. 71, l. 5; et AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS, *Sermones* – ed. C. Lambot, (CC SL, 41), 1961, Sermo 10, l. 234

⁶ pax – unum] Eph. 2, 14

⁷ per – terra] Col. 1, 20

⁸ in se – gentes Iudeis] cfr Col. 1, 20

⁹ annunciauit – prope] Eph. 2, 16 – 17; cfr. Is. 57, 19

¹⁰ pacem – uobis] Ioh. 14, 27

¹¹ pacem – peruenientibus do] GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Homiliae in euangelia* – ed. R. Etaix (CC SL, 141), 1999, lib. 2, Homilia 30, par. 3, p. 259, l. 94

¹² Christus – sapientia] I Cor. 1, 24

*scientie absconditi*¹³ diues est in omnes qui inuocant illum qui *cum diues esset pro nobis pauper factus est*¹⁴ ut nos eius inopia ditaremur. Hic est *homo ille diues qui habebat uillicum*¹⁵ qui gloria et honore coronatus est a Patre. In hiis omnibus, plusquam Salomon hic.

25 Salomon multa sciuit, sed Christus omnia: “*nunc scimus*,” inquit, “*quia scis omnia et non opus est tibi ut quis te interroget*.”¹⁶ Salomon multa habuit, sed Christus dicit, “*omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo*.”¹⁷ *Sciens*, inquit Ihesus, “*quia omnia dedit ei*”¹⁸ *Pater in manus*.”¹⁹ Salomonis gloria etiam quando maxime effulsit, *feno* tamen *agri qui hodie est et cras in clibanum mittitur*²⁰ comparata, minor inuenitur. “*Dico*,” inquit, “*uobis quod nec Solomon in omni gloria sua coopertus*²¹ *est sicut unum ex istis*.”²² Uere *omnis caro fenum*,²³ et minusquam fenum, quia fenum,
30 dum exaescit etsi perdit decoris²⁴ gloriam, putredinis tamen iniuriam non| incurrit. Etsi non 48rb
redolet sicut prius, non fecit tamen sicut cadauer hominis quo nullum aliud horribilius nullum fetidiusne?²⁵ Christi gloria etiam quando abiectissimus in cruce fuit, tamen Patris gloriam coequauit quia Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est diuinitas, equalis gloria, coeterna maiestas. Ergo²⁶ sicut dixi in hiis omnibus plusquam Salomon hic.

35 ‘In diebus,’ inquit, ‘illis,’ hic est in diebus Salomonis regis. Qui sunt dies Salomonis? Dies illi in quibus Christus se esse regem manifestissime demonstrauit ut est dies natiuitatis Dominice, dies passionis, dies resurrectionis, dies ascensionis. In primo diei, regem nouum monstraui stella noua. In secundo, nouus titulus crucis. In tertio, noua mortis uictoria. In quarto, nouus
ascendentis triumphus.²⁷

40 In primo die, dixit magi de illo, “*stella ista sicut flamma chruscat, et Regem regum Deum demonstrat*.”²⁸ In secundo die, scripsit Pilatus de illo, “*Ihesus Nazarenus, Rex Iudeorum*.”²⁹ In

¹³ in – absconditi] Col. 2, 3

¹⁴ cum – factus est] II Cor. 8, 9

¹⁵ homo – uillicum] Luc. 16, 1

¹⁶ nunc – interroget] Ioh. 16, 30

¹⁷ omnia – meo] Luc. 10, 22; Matth. 11, 27

¹⁸ ei] enim *scripsit Z*

¹⁹ Sciens – manus] Ioh. 13, 3

²⁰ feno – mittitur] Matth. 6, 30

²¹ sua coopertus] sicca cooperatus *scripsit Z*

²² dico – istis] Matth. 6, 29

²³ omnis – fenum] Is. 40, 6

²⁴ decoris] dacoris *scripsit Z*

²⁵ cadauer – fetidiusne] LOTHARII CARDINALIS (INNOCENTII III), *De miseria humane conditionis* – ed. M. Maccarrone, (*Thesaurus Mundi*), 1955, lib. III.IV, p. 80

²⁶ Ergo] ergo sancti *scripsit Z*

²⁷ triumphus] triumphus *scripsit Z*

²⁸ stella – demonstrat] “*Stella ista sicut flamma chruscat*,” Antiphona epiphaniae, Antiphona quinta in modo 7

²⁹ Ihesus – Iudeorum] Ioh. 19, 19

tertio, cantat Ecclesia per totum mundum de illo, “*Dominus regnavit decorem inductus est.*”³⁰ In quarto, cantauerunt angeli de illo, “*attollite portas, principes, uestras, et eleuamini, porte eternales, et introibit rex glorie.*”³¹

45 In primo die, probauit Christus se esse regem uirginum quando natus est ineffabiliter ex uirgine. In secundo, probauit se esse regem confessorum quando latrones confitentis misertus est in cruce. In tertio, probauit se esse regem martirum quando sanas uulnerum cicatrices ostendit in re diuina carne. In quarto, probauit se esse regem angelorum quando *uolauit super cherubin et super pennas uentorum*³² et calcauit colla superbiorum demonum propria uirtute.³³

50 In prima die, coronauit eum in regem mater sua dyademate carneo,³⁴ sicut scriptum est, *egredimini filie Syon et uidete regem Salomonem in diademate quo coronauit eum mater sua.*³⁵ In secunda die, coronauit eum in regem nouerca sua diademate spineo,³⁶ sicut scriptum est, *tunc milites plectentes coronam de spinis possunt super caput eius.*³⁷ Item *exiit ergo Ihesus portans spineam coronam et purpureum uestimentum.*³⁸ In tertia die, coronauit eum pater suus in regem corona exultacionis et leticie, sicut scriptum est, *conuertisti planctum meum in gaudium mihi, concidisti sacum meum et circumdediti me leticia.*³⁹ In quarto die, rursus coronauit eum pater suus in regem corona glorie et honoris, sicut scriptum est, *gloria et honore coronasti eum et constituisti eum super opera manuum tuarum.*⁴⁰ In hiis quatuor diebus inuenire est quatuor anni tempora; id est hyemem et uer, estate et autumpnum.

60 Christus namque in hyeme natus est; in uere passus eciam ad litteram; in estate uero resurrexit; in autumpno ascendit, non ad litteram, sed ad figuram. In estate namque metimus; in autumpno messes trituras, botrus calcamus, poma decerpimus et totius anni fructus reponimus in tuto. Similiter Christus in resurrectione messuit quod ante seminauerat; in ascensione reposuit quod in resurrectione messuerat,⁴¹ sicut scriptum est, *quem oportet uerum celum suscipere*⁴² et seruare

48va

³⁰ Dominus – inductus est] Ps. 92, 1

³¹ attollite – glorie] Ps. 23, 7

³² uolauit – uentorum] Ps. 17, 11; cfr II Reg. 22, 11

³³ calcauit – uirtute] cfr “Sapientia aedificauit sibi domum,” (Prou. 9, 1), Antiphona de Sapientia

³⁴ coronauit – carneo] cfr GUERRICUS IGNIACENSIS, *In assumptione beatae Mariae uirginis 4* – ed. J. Morson et J. Costello (SC, 202), 1973, p. 466, l. 112

³⁵ egredimini – sua] Cant. 3, 11

³⁶ coronauit – spineo] cfr BERNARDUS CLARAEUALLENSIS, *Sermones in epiphania Domini* – ed. J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (*Bernardi opera*, vol. 4), Sermo 2, par. 3, p. 302, l. 15

³⁷ tunc – eius] Matth. 27, 29; Ioh. 19, 2

³⁸ exiit – uestimentum] Ioh. 19, 5

³⁹ conuertisti – leticia] Ps. 29, 12

⁴⁰ gloria – tuarum] Ps. 8, 6 – 7

⁴¹ resurrectione messuerat] resurrectione reposuit messuerat *scripsit Z*

⁴² quem – suscipere] Act. 3, 21

65 *usque in diem manifestacionis sue.*⁴³ Hic est annus de quo scriptum est, *ut predicarem annum placabilem Domino.*⁴⁴ *Quis est ergo ex omnibus nobis qui uult uitam et cupit uidere dies bonos?*⁴⁵

Dies uidelicet resurrectionis et ascensionis obseruet dies primos; id est natiuitatis et passionis. Nam duo primi meritorii sunt, duo secundi retributorii. Duo primi temporales sunt, duo secundi eternales. Duo primi sunt dies seminandi, duo secundi⁴⁶ dies metendi. In primo die seminauit
70 Christus paupertatem et innocentiam, *nudus enim egressus est de utero matris sue*⁴⁷ sicut alii, et absque peccato uel suo uel alieno plus quam omnes alii. In secundo die seminauit humilitatem et patientiam quando *humiliauit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.*⁴⁸ In tertio die messuit exultationem et leticiam. In quarto, honorem et gloriam. Item in diebus seminandi, seminauit luctum et miseriam: plorauit enim in natiuitate, plorauit in passione,
75 sicut scriptum est, ‘uagit infans inter astra conditus presepia.’⁴⁹ Item *cum clamore ualido et lacrimis offerens exauditus est pro sua reuerencia.*⁵⁰ Ideo gaudium et consolacionem messura, sicut scriptum est, *beati qui lugent quoniam ipsi consolabuntur.*⁵¹ Item *qui seminant in lacrimis, in gaudio metent.*⁵² Idcirco luctum et miseriam iubemur seminare cum dicatur, *miseri estote et lugete risus uester in luctum conuertatur et gaudium in maiorem.*⁵³ *Quecumque enim seminauerit*
80 *homo hec et metet.*⁵⁴ *Qui obseruat inquit uentum non seminat et considerat nubes numquam metit.*⁵⁵

Duo uenti sunt: auster et aquilo. Primus, leuis et calidus; id est gratia Dei. Secundus, durus et frigidus; id est tribulatio. Primum considerat qui dicit, “si haberem Dei gratiam, bene uiuerem, peccata declinarem, sanctus essem. Sed quia non habeo, non possum hec facere,”⁵⁶ quia scriptum est: *sine me nichil potestis facere.*⁵⁷ Secundum considerat qui dicit “*durus est hic sermo*⁵⁸ uel *leo est in uia, leena in itineribus*⁵⁹ *in medio platearum occidendus sum.*”⁶⁰ Hic est uentus uehemens et

⁴³ usque – sue] Luc. 1, 80

⁴⁴ ut – domino] Is. 61, 2

⁴⁵ quis – bonos] Ps. 33, 13

⁴⁶ secundi] secundi in primo *scripsit Z et in primo expunxit*

⁴⁷ nudus – sue] Iob 1, 21

⁴⁸ humiliauit – crucis] Phil. 2, 8

⁴⁹ uagit – presepia] VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS, *Pange Lingua* in H. T. Henry, “The Poet of Passiontide,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 4, (1891): p. 179 – 194, p. 188.

⁵⁰ cum – reuerencia] Hebr. 5, 7

⁵¹ beati – consolabuntur] Matth. 5, 5

⁵² Qui – metent] Ps. 125, 5

⁵³ miseri – maiorem] Iac. 4, 9

⁵⁴ Que[cumque] – metet] Gal. 6, 8; BEDA UENERABILIS, *In epistulas septem catholicas* – ed. D. Hurst, (CC SL, 121), 1983, lib. 1 (in Iac.), cap. 3, l. 297

⁵⁵ qui – metit] Eccle. 11, 4

⁵⁶ si haberem – facere] cfr Ps. 36, 27

⁵⁷ sine – facere] Ioh. 15, 5

⁵⁸ durus – sermo] Ioh. 6, 61

⁵⁹ leo – itineribus] Prou. 26, 13

⁶⁰ In medio – occidendus sum] Prou. 22, 13

ueniens a regione deserti, qui concutit quatuor angulos domus.⁶¹ Uel auster est presumptio, aquilo desperatio. Primum considerat qui dicit, *miseratio dei magna est multitudinis peccatorum meorum*⁶² *miserebitur*.⁶³ Secundum considerat qui dicit, *maior est iniquitas mea quam ut ueniam merear*.⁶⁴

90

Quidam seminant et non metunt; quidam seminant et metunt; quidam metunt et non seminant; quidam nec metunt nec seminant. Primi sunt murmurantes quibus graua sunt quaecumque bona faciunt qui spirituali consolatione nondum recepta⁶⁵ opprimuntur *a pusillanimitate spiritus et tempestate*.⁶⁶ Isti dicuntur a propheta, *quiescat uox tua a ploratu et oculi tui a lacrimis quia etiam merces opera tuo*.⁶⁷ Isti etsi *in lacrimis seminant* modo quandoque tamen *metent in gaudio*⁶⁸ si tamen murmurare desierint. Secundi sunt qui *primicias spiritus*⁶⁹ accipientes *gloriantur non solum in spe glorie filiorum Dei sed etiam in tribulationibus*,⁷⁰ dicentes cum Apostolo: “*repletus sum gaudio superhabundo consolatione in omni tribulatione mea*.”⁷¹ In istis *arator comprehendit messorum*⁷² quia dum laborant hilariter spicas diuine consolationis colliguntur⁷³ in supremam missionem.⁷⁴ Isti ‘centuplum accipiunt in presenti et in futuro uitam eternam,’⁷⁵ quorum operi duplex merces redditur in uia in patria⁷⁶ qui *leuam sponsi habent sub capite* — id est diuinam consolationem in mente nunc in presenti — et *dextra illius amplexati sunt*⁷⁷ — id est illi in tuto *reposita est corona iusticie*⁷⁸ sunt — quibus *iam dicit spiritus ut requiescant a laboribus suis*⁷⁹ *a quorum oculis abstergit Deus omnem lacrimam*⁸⁰ qui iam *de fructu*⁸¹ *manuum suarum*⁸² edunt.⁸³

95

100

⁶¹ uentus – domus] Iob 1:19

⁶² meorum] in eorum *scripsit* Z

⁶³ miseratio – miserebitur] Eccli. 5, 6

⁶⁴ maior – merear] Gen. 4, 13

⁶⁵ spirituali – recepta] BERNARDUS CLAR., *Sermones in die paschae* – ed. J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (*Bernardi opera*, vol. 5), 1968, Sermo 4, par. 2, p. 111, l. 1

⁶⁶ a pusillanimitate – tempestate] Ps. 54, 9

⁶⁷ quiescat – opera tuo] Ier. 31, 16

⁶⁸ in lacrimis seminant metent in gaudio] Ps. 125, 5

⁶⁹ primicias spiritus] Rom. 8, 23

⁷⁰ in spe – tribulationibus] Rom. 5, 2 – 3

⁷¹ repletus – mea] II Cor. 7, 4

⁷² arator – messorum] Am. 9, 13

⁷³ colliguntur] colligimini *scripsit* Z

⁷⁴ colliguntur – missionem] cfr HILDEBERTUS LAUARDINENSIS in *Quaedam epistulae ad Bernardum Claraeuallensem* – ed. J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (*Bernardi opera*, vol. 7), 1968, ep. 122, p. 303

⁷⁵ centuplum – eternam] cfr Matth. 19, 29; et cfr BEDA UEN., *In prouerbia Salomonis libri iii* – ed. D. Hurst (CC SL, 119B), 1983, lib. 2, cap. 11, l. 112

⁷⁶ merces – patria] cfr AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS, *Sermones* – (PL, 38) Sermo 306, col. 1405, l. 21

⁷⁷ leuam sponsi... sub capite... dextra – sunt] Cant. 2, 4

⁷⁸ reposita – iusticie] II Tim. 4, 8

⁷⁹ iam – suis] Apoc. 14, 13

⁸⁰ a quorum – lacrimam] Apoc. 7, 17

⁸¹ fructu] frictu *scripsit* Z

105 Quarti sunt qui nec bonam operationem serunt nec consolationem metunt uel qui *seminant dolores et metunt eos*⁸⁴ uel qui *seminant mala in sulcis iniustitie et metent ea in septuplum*.⁸⁵ “Quid colligunt,” ait Augustinus, “qui nichil seminauerunt? Immo colligunt sed quod seminauerunt. Spinas seminauerunt, ignem colligunt;”⁸⁶ sordes seminauerunt, fetores colligunt; putredines seminauerunt, uermes colligunt: ignem qui non exstinguitur, uermes qui non moriuntur,⁸⁷ fetores
110 qui non finiuntur. Isti aut nulli aut mali seminatores dicendi sunt et messorum. Huc usque de Salomone, nunc de archa uideamus.

Tres archas legimus in scripturis: archam Noe, archam Moysi, archam montis illius, scilicet, in cuius cacumine Deus locutus est ad Moysen.⁸⁸ Prima facta est *de lignis*⁸⁹ *leuigatis*;⁹⁰ secunda *de lignis sechim*;⁹¹ de tertia non dicitur unde facta sit quia materialis non est sed tota spiritualis.
115 Prima generalis est; secunda specialis; tertia singularis. Prima misericordie; secunda gratie; tertia glorie.⁹² Prima est Ecclesia in terris militans; tertia angelorum milicia nobis in terra militans et sibi in celo triumphans; ad cuius exemplar, secunda facta est in figura Christi uel Ecclesie uel Marie. Prima facta est ad diluuium euadendum; secunda ad sanctuarium conseruandum; tertia ad
120 exemplum demonstrandum. De prima et tertia ad presens omittamus, de secunda dicturi [sumus].⁹³ Secunda, ut iam dictum est, figurat Christum uel Ecclesiam uel Mariam.⁹⁴ Sed quomodo Christum uel Ecclesiam <figura>mus?⁹⁵ Quomodo Mariam?

Dicemus triplici de causa: qualitate Marie; similitudine forme; ratione continentie. Materia huius arche sunt ligna sechim de quibus compacta est et aurum mundissimum et spissum quo intus et exterius deaurata.⁹⁶ Ligna sichim dicuntur esse leuia, incremabilia, inputribilia. Maria leuis fuit,
125 absque peccati pondere quo nichil onerosius⁹⁷. Unde iniquitas dicitur sedere super *talentum plumbi*⁹⁸ et psalmus: *iniquitates mee supergressae sunt caput meum et sicut onus graue grauata*

⁸² de fructu manuum suarum] Prou. 31, 16

⁸³ edunt. Quarti sunt...] Terti sunt... *abest*

⁸⁴ seminant – eos] Iob 4, 8

⁸⁵ Seminant² – septuplum] Eccli. 7, 3

⁸⁶ quid – ignem colligunt] AUG., Sermo. – (CC SL, 41), Sermo 31, l. 131.

colligunt] colligite *scripsit* Z

⁸⁷ ignem – moriuntur] cfr Marc. 9, 43; Is. 66, 24

⁸⁸ in cuius – Moysen] cfr Ex. 19, 20

⁸⁹ lignis] linguis *scripsit et emendauit* Z

⁹⁰ de lignis leuigatis] Gen. 6, 14

⁹¹ de lignis sechim] Ex. 25, 10

⁹² prima – glorie] BERNARDUS CLAR., *Sermones de diuresis* – ed. J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (*Bernardi opera*, vol. 6), 1970, Sermo 76, p. 315, l. 3

⁹³ dicturi sumus] dicturi *scripsit* Z.

⁹⁴ Mariam] Maria *scripsit* Z.

⁹⁵ Ecclesiam <...>timus] *vacant sextae litterae*

⁹⁶ aurum – deaurata] cfr Ex. 25, 10 – 11

⁹⁷ onerosius] onerosius *scripsit* Z

⁹⁸ talentum plumbi] Zach. 5, 7

talentum plumbi] talamum pluribus *scripsit* Z

sunt super me.⁹⁹ Maria nullo uiciorum igne potuit aduri sed incombustibilis permansit per gratiam
Spiritus Sancti et obumbracionem uirtutis altissimi,¹⁰⁰ ideoque caro eius — de qua est¹⁰¹ caro
 saluatoris — nullam sensit putredinem, nullam uidit corrupcionem¹⁰²: leuis fuit in natiuitate,
 130 incombustibilis in conceptione, inputribilis in morte. De primo: *ecce ascendet super nubem leuem*
et ingredietur Egyptum.¹⁰³ De secundo: ‘rubum quem¹⁰⁴ uiderat Moyses incombustum,
 conseruatam agnouimus tuam uirginitatem, Dei genitrix.’¹⁰⁵ De tertio: ‘ueneranda nobis domine
 huius diei festiuitas opem conferat salutarem in qua sancta Dei genitrix mortem subiit temporalem
 nec tamen mortis nexibus deprimi potuit que filium tuum dominum nostrum de se genuit
 135 incarnatum.’¹⁰⁶ Leuitas nobis necessaria est iniquitati non consenciamus et ut per uiam arduam
 infatigabiles ascendamus. Incombustibilitas ut in medio flammaram sine lesione uiuamus et
 nostras concupiscentias uereamus.¹⁰⁷ Inputreabilitas ut precipue senciemus castitatem resistentes
 libidini ne in nostro stercore putrescamus¹⁰⁸ sicut illi de quibus scriptum est, *computruerunt*
iuuenta in stercore suo.¹⁰⁹
 140 Aurum mundissimum quo hec archa intus et exterius deaurata est sapientiam celestem figurat¹¹⁰
 que tota in timore Dei et amore consistit. Aurum immundum est, *sapientia huius mundi que*
*stulticia est apud Deum*¹¹¹ uel *prudencia carnis que inimica est Deo*.¹¹² Sed aurum mundissimum
 est sapientia celestis, que *primum quidem pudica est deinde pacifica, modesta, suadibilis, bonis*
 145 *consenciens, plena misericordia et fructibus bonis, <non> iudicans, sine simulacione. Fructus*
autem iusticie in pace seminatur facientibus pacem.¹¹³ Hoc est aurum mundissimum; id est sine
 macula flagicii, sine ruga facinoris, sine aliquo eiusmodi. | Hoc est sine palea leuitatis et puluere
 iactancie et pallore simulacionis.¹¹⁴ Aurum sicut et *ferrum de terra tollitur*¹¹⁵ et *sapientia hec*

49rb

⁹⁹ peccati pondere – super me] cfr HIERONYMUS, *Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei* – ed. D. Hurst et M. Adriaen, (CC SL, 77), 1969, lib. 2, l. 264

iniquitates mee – super me] Ps.37, 5

¹⁰⁰ Spiritus – altissimi] cfr Luc. 1, 35

¹⁰¹ est] et scripsit Z

¹⁰² caro eius – corruptionem] cfr AELREDUS RIEUALLENSIS, *Sermones I – LXXXIV* – ed. G. Raciti, (CC CM, 2B), 2001, Sermo 74, par. 79, p. 267, l. 695; et cfr MAXIMUS TAURINENSIS, *Collectio sermonum antiqua* – ed. A. Mutzenbecher, (CC SL, 23) 1962, Sermo 42, l. 105

¹⁰³ ecce – Egyptum] Is. 19, 1

¹⁰⁴ quem] quam scripsit Z

¹⁰⁵ rubum – genitrix] “Rubum, quem uiderat Moyses incombustum,” Antiphona laudis

¹⁰⁶ ueneranda – incarnatum] Assumptio S. Mariae, In die ad misam

¹⁰⁷ uereamus] uereamus scripsit Z

¹⁰⁸ putrescamus] pustrescamus scripsit Z

¹⁰⁹ computruerunt – suo] Ioel 1, 17

¹¹⁰ Aurum – figurat] cfr AELREDUS, *Serm. I – LXXXIV*, Sermo 74, par. 79, p. 267, l. 695

¹¹¹ sapientia – Deum] I Cor. 3, 19

¹¹² prudencia – Deo] Rom. 8, 6 – 7

¹¹³ primum – pacem] Iac. 3, 17 – 18

¹¹⁴ simulacionis] sumulacionis scripsit Z

¹¹⁵ ferrum – tollitur] Iob 28, 2

trahitur de occultis.¹¹⁶ Aurum omni metallo preciosius est et sapientia hec *preciosior est cunctis*¹¹⁷
 opibus et omnia que desiderantur ei non ualent comparari.¹¹⁸ Aurum fulgidum est: in facie
 150 prudentis lucet sapientia.¹¹⁹ Aurum per ignem probatur¹²⁰: doctrina uiri per patientiam
 noscitur,¹²¹ tamque aurum in fornace probauit electos dominus et quasi holocausti hostiam accepit
 eos.¹²² In igne probatur aurum et argentum homines uero receptibiles in camino humiliacionis.¹²³
 Sapientia in temptatione ambulat cum homine.¹²⁴ Hoc¹²⁵ auro deaurata fuit Maria intus et exterius;
 id est in carne et spiritu, in corde et corpore, in actibus et affectibus suis, omnia sapienter actitans
 155 et cogitans. Fuit ante hec deauracio non tenuis sed crassa; id est non leuis sed ponderosa, non
 instabilia sed firmissima, non mobilia sed fixa, non horaria sed continua, non paucorum dierum
 sed omnium.

Hec de Maria forma uero erat quadrata parte altera longior, *habens in longitudinem duos cubitos*¹²⁶
*et dimidium, in latitudinem cubitum et semissem, et tantundem in altitudine.*¹²⁷ Quadratura arche
 160 constantissimam figurat mentem uirginis Marie que ad omnes mundanas uarietates et euentus
 fortuitos immobilis superstetit et quieta resedit. Nichil obstupens tamquam nouum, nichil
 expauescens tamquam insolitum, nichil suspiciens tamquam excelsum, nichil tamquam
 magnificatum concupiscens. Que autem forma hec parte altera longior fuit, figurat Mariam plus se
*extendisse ad ea que ante sunt*¹²⁸ quam presentibus et temporalibus adhesisse. Longitudo arche
 165 longanimitatem fidei figurat. Hec duo habet interualla: ante et retro. Credit enim unum Deum
 eternum sine principio et sine fine superfuisse et superfore immo ut uerius dicatur ‘superesse.’
 Nam in Deo non est “fuit” uel nichil ei preteritum, nichil futurum, sed omnia presencia (etiam que
 nobis sunt uel preterita uel futurum). ‘Eternitas’ enim nichil aliud est quam ‘interminabilis uite
 tota simul et perfecta possessio,’¹²⁹ nichil unius diuinitate et fide, unus Dominus, una scienda quod
 170 *Dei uirtus et Dei sapientia*¹³⁰ sic ab altitudine sua potuit descendere ut eam non desereret et sic a
 descensu suo potuit ascendere et in summa perfectione sua stabilis et immobilis permanet. Sicut
 enim sol cum radios suos in terram dirigit uel cum eosdem a terra subtrahit¹³¹ celi cum sub luna

¹¹⁶ sapientia – occultis] Iob 28, 18

¹¹⁷ cunctis] coctis *scripsit Z*

¹¹⁸ preciosior – comparari] Prou. 3, 15

¹¹⁹ in facie – sapientia] Prou. 17, 24

¹²⁰ aurum – probatur] I Petr. 1, 7

¹²¹ doctrina – noscitur] Prou. 19, 11

¹²² tamque – eos] Sap. 3, 6

¹²³ In igne – humiliacionis] Eccli. 2, 5

¹²⁴ in temptatione – cum] Eccli. 4, 18

¹²⁵ Hoc] hic *scripsit Z*

¹²⁶ cubitos] cupitos *scripsit Z*

¹²⁷ habens – altitudine] cfr Ex. 37, 1

¹²⁸ se extendisse – sunt] cfr Phil. 3, 13

¹²⁹ Eternitas...interminabilis – possessio] BOETHIUS, *De Consolatione Philosophiae* – ed. Migne, (PL, 63), lib. 5, prosa 6, col. 858A

¹³⁰ Dei – sapientia] I Cor. 1, 24

¹³¹ subtrahit] trahit *scripsit Z sed sub supra lineam addidit*

non relinquit, sic perfecto descensus uel ascensus incarnate sapientie nihil| minuit de ueritate
 stabilitatis sue. Hic est immutabilitatis diuine, ante *quam non est transmutacio nec uicissitudinis*
 175 *obumbratio*¹³² qui ‘stabilis manens dat cuncta moueri.’¹³³

Cum ergo dicitur Christus descendisse uel ascendisse, nichil mutabile, nichil locale circa naturam
 assumptam figurat sed tamen modo circa assumptam. Sed propter unitatem persone quicquid de
 una dicitur et de altera non incongrue predicatur, unde ueritas in euangelio: *nemo ascendit in*
*celum nisi qui descendit de celo; Filius hominis qui est in celo.*¹³⁴ Mirum est quod dicit: si de celo
 180 descenderat qui ibi erat, quomodo illuc iterum ascensurum erat? Sed quod dicitur, *descendit* uel
ascendit ad naturam hominis assumptam pertinet et qui uero dicitur *est in celo* ad assumptam
 naturam uerbi. Est ergo sensus: *Filius hominis qui super est in celo* per diuine maiestatis
 immutabilem statum ipse solus *descendit de celo* per incarnationis misterium et ipse solus *ascendit*
in celum uirtute propria per eiusdem carnis exaltate triumphum. Omnia membra sua, quorum ipse
 185 caput est, trahendo secum cum enim hanc fecerit: etiam tunc solus ascendet quia caput et corpus
 unus est Christus, ait ergo Apostolus, *qui descendit ipse est et qui ascendit.*¹³⁵

Descensus iste dupliciter intelligendus est: localiter et moraliter. Localis Christi descensio quatuor
 gradus habuit. Descendit enim primo in mundi, secundo in Egyptum, tertio in sepulcrum, quarto
 in infernum: in mundum ut hominem saluaret; in Egyptum ut Herodem declinaret¹³⁶; in sepulcrum
 190 ut post laborem quiesceret; in infernum ut eundem morderet et predam suam inde abstraheret.
 Hiis eisdem gradibus descendunt sancti per considerationem: in mundum ut uideant qui sunt;¹³⁷ in
 sepulcrum ut sciant quid futuri sunt; in infernum¹³⁸ ut sciant quid meruerunt. In mundo est
 calamitas; in Egypto iniquitas; in sepulcro fetor et putredo; in inferno sempiternus horror et
 desperacio. Prima consideracio parit contemptum mundi, iuxta illud Gregorii, olim ‘mundus
 195 aliquando nos retraxit a Deo, nunc tantis calamitatibus plenus est, ut nos mittat ad Deum.’¹³⁹
 Secunda consideracio tollit contemptum proximi, nam qui bene considerat iniquitatem propriam
 numquam pluris estimat alienam. Tertia parit contemptum sui, iuxta illud *quid superbit terra et*
*cinis,*¹⁴⁰ *homo putredo et filius hominis uermis,*¹⁴¹ *putredini inquit dixi pater meus es, mater mea et*
*soror mea, uermibus.*¹⁴² Quarta consideracio parit contemptum contemptus alieni qui enim
 200 contempnendo Deum se dampnationem eternam meruisse intelligit non magnopere creatur cum
 contempni ab alio se cognoscit. Hec sunt illa| quatuor que beatus Malachias in duobus uersiculis

¹³² quam – obumbratio] Iac. 1, 17

¹³³ stabilis – moueri] BOETHIUS, *De Consol. Phil.*, lib. 3, metrum 9, col. 758A

¹³⁴ nemo – celo²] Ioh. 3, 13

¹³⁵ qui descendit – qui ascendit] Eph. 4, 10

¹³⁶ declinaret] declinanret *scripsit Z et n expunxit*

¹³⁷ In mundum ... in sepulcrum] in Egypto *abest*

¹³⁸ infernum] infernus *scripsit Z*

¹³⁹ mundus – Deum] GREG. MAGN., *Hom. in evan.*, lib. 2, Hom. 28, par. 3, p. 243, l. 84

¹⁴⁰ quid – cinis] Eccli. 10, 9

¹⁴¹ homo – uermis] Iob 25, 6

¹⁴² putredini – uermibus] Iob 17, 14

— non minus utiliter quam subtiliter — comprehendit, dicens: “spernere mundum, spernere nullum, spernere sese, spernere se sperni, quatuor hec bona sunt.”¹⁴³

205 Mortalis ante Christi descensio trium graduum fuit sed omnino maximorum descendit enim sub seipsum, sub angelum, sub hominem uniuersum: sub seipsum formam serui accipiens; sub angelum passibili et mortali carne se induens; sub hominem uniuersum non solum Marie et Ioseph tamquam suis parentibus subiectionem exhibens sed etiam precursoris sui baptismum expetens, discipulorum suorum pedes abluens, inimicorum suorum iniquissime inuoluntatibus uoluntarie semet tradens. Quare autem sic descendit? Certe descendit non sibi sed nobis, sicut scriptum est:
210 “qui proper homines et nostram salutem descendit de¹⁴⁴ celis.”¹⁴⁵ Descendit Deus ab homine ut homo ascenderet ad Deum.¹⁴⁶ Ascenderet ante sic: primo super seipsum; secundo super mundum; tertio super celum. Super seipsum, tripliciter: super carnis uoluptatem, super propriam¹⁴⁷ uoluntatem, super humanam rationem.¹⁴⁸ Carnis uoluptas est immunda superfluis. Propria uoluntas in acquiescendo propriis iudiciis et consiliis plus quam alienis. Humana ratio est in
215 argumentando tamen de inferioribus causis. Ascende, ergo, super carnis uoluptatem ne sis luxuriosus; super propria uoluntatem ne sis elatus; super humanam rationem ne sis incredulus. De primo, “uoluptas habet penam et necessitas parat coronam.”¹⁴⁹ Item, “mors secus introitum¹⁵⁰ delectacionis ponita est”¹⁵¹ et Poeta, “sperne uoluptates, nocet empta dolore uoluptas.”¹⁵² De secundo, “a uoluptatibus tuis auertere.”¹⁵³ Post, “concupiscentias tuas non eas.”¹⁵⁴ “Non ueni
220 facere uoluntatem meam sed uoluntatem eius qui misit me.”¹⁵⁵ *Melior est patiens uiro forte et qui*

¹⁴³ spernere¹ – sperni] GAUFRIDUS AUTISSIODORENSIS, *Super Apocalypsim* – ed. Ferruccio Gastaldelli, (*Temi e Testi*, 17), 1970, Sermo 20, p. 234, l. 353 – 354

¹⁴⁴ de] des *scripsit* Z

¹⁴⁵ qui – celis] *Symbolum Nicaenum*

¹⁴⁶ Descendit Deus – ad Deum] PETRUS DAMIANI, *Sermones* – ed. I. Lucchesi, (*CC CM*, 57), 1983, Sermo 65, l. 15

¹⁴⁷ propriam] propria *scripsit* Z

¹⁴⁸ descendit enim sub seipsum [l. 187]– super humanam rationem] cfr THOMAS CISTERCIENSIS, *In Cantica Canticorum* – ed. Iodoco Badio Ascensio, 1521, lib. 9, f. 128vb

¹⁴⁹ uoluptas – coronam] BENEDICTUS DE NURSIA, *Regula* – ed. A. de Vogüé, (*SC*, 181 – 182), 1972, cap. 7.33

¹⁵⁰ introitum] mortuum *scripsit* Z

¹⁵¹ mors – ponita est] BENEDICTUS, *Regula* – ed. A. de Vogüé, (*SC*, 181 – 182), 1972, cap. 7.24

¹⁵² uoluptas habet penam – dolore uoluptas] cfr THOMAS CIST., *In Cantica Canticorum* – ed. Iodoco Badio Ascensio, 1521, lib. 9, f. 128vb

sperne – uoluptas] HORATIUS (QUINTUS HORATIUS FLACCUS), *Epistulae* – ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, (*Teubner*, 3rd ed.), 1995, lib. 1, epist. 2, ver. 55, p. 257

¹⁵³ a uoluptatibus – auertere] Eccli. 18, 30; BENEDICTUS, *Regula* – ed. A. de Vogüé, (*SC*, 181 – 182), 1972, cap. 7.19

¹⁵⁴ concupiscentias – eas] BENEDICTUS, *Regula* – ed. A. de Vogüé, (*SC*, 181 – 182), 1972, cap. 7.19

¹⁵⁵ Non ueni – misit me] Ioh. 6, 38; BENEDICTUS, *Regula* – ed. A. de Vogüé, (*SC*, 181 – 182), 1972, cap. 5.13

- dominatur animo suo expugnatore*¹⁵⁶ ut “ira¹⁵⁷ furor brevis est, animum rege,¹⁵⁸ qui nisi paret imperat; hec frenis hec tu compesce cathenis”¹⁵⁹ (uel secundum aliam litteram “contunde flagellis”). Compesce frenis et cathenis,” ne in illicebas ruat; contunde flagellis ne ad bonum pigrescat.¹⁶⁰ Item ‘qui se cupit esse potentem animas domet ille feroces, et licet ultima¹⁶¹ longe tellus tua iura tremiscat,¹⁶² tamen atras uincere curas miserasque leuare querelas non posse potentia non est.’¹⁶³ Item ‘latius regnes audium domando spiritum quam si libiam <remotis>¹⁶⁴ Gadibus iungas et uterque poenus¹⁶⁵ seruiat uni.’^{166, 167} De tertio, Iheronimus multa in scripturis sanctis indentur incredibilia, que tamen uera sunt: ‘nichil enim ualet natura contra nature Dominum,’¹⁶⁸ propria uoluntas est, quecumque a diuina uoluntate discordat.
- 230 Tres sunt species uolunta[tis]¹⁶⁹: est ‘uoluntas Patris, uoluntas Spiritus, uoluntas carnis.’¹⁷⁰ Uoluntas Patris est uitam dare; uoluntas spiritus obedire; uoluntas carnis desideriis suis satisfacere. Prima uoluntas honoranda est. Secunda facienda. Tertia dirigenda.¹⁷¹ De prima, *numquid*¹⁷² *uoluntatis mee est mors impii dicit Dominus et non magis ut conuertatur et uiuat?*¹⁷³ De secunda, ‘in hiis Paterna gloria, in hiis uoluntas Spiritus,’¹⁷⁴ qui enim uoluntati diuine obedimus de Spiritu Sancto

50ra

¹⁵⁶ Melior – expugnatore] Prou. 16, 32

¹⁵⁷ ira] iira *scripsit* Z

¹⁵⁸ animum rege] omnium roge *scripsit* Z

¹⁵⁹ ira – cathenis] HORATIUS, *Epistulae* – ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, (*Teubner*, 3rd ed.), 1995, lib. 1, epist. 2, ver. 62, p. 257

¹⁶⁰ pigrescat] pinguant *scripsit* Z

¹⁶¹ ultima] ultima in THOMAS CIST., *In Cantica Canticorum*, lib. 9, f. 128vb; *sed* indica in BOETHIUS, *De Consol. Phil.*, lib. 3, metrum 5, col. 744A

¹⁶² iura tremiscat] uita tremiscunt *scripsit* Z

tremiscat] et seruiat ultima thyle *abest*

¹⁶³ qui se cupit – non est] BOETHIUS, *De Consol. Phil.*, lib. 3, metrum 5, col. 744A

¹⁶⁴ remotis] remotis *abest*, *vacant septimae litterae post* ‘libiam’

¹⁶⁵ poenus] plenus *scripsit* Z

¹⁶⁶ latius – uni] HORATIUS, *Carmina* – ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, (*Teubner*, 3rd ed.), 1995, lib. 2, Carmen 2, ver. 9, p. 44

¹⁶⁷ secundo, “a uoluptatibus tuis auertere” – uterque poenus seruiat uni] cfr THOMAS CIST., *In Cantica Canticorum*, lib. 9, f. 128vb – 129ra

¹⁶⁸ nichil – Dominum] cfr HIERONYMUS, *Epistulae* – ed. I Hilberg, (*CSEL*, 55), 1912, epist. 72, par. 2, p. 9, l. 13.

¹⁶⁹ uoluntatis] uolutatis *scripsit* Z

¹⁷⁰ uoluntas¹ – carnis] BERNARDUS CLAR., *Sententiae* – ed. J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (*Bernardi opera*, vol. 6.2), 1972, series 3, sentential 114, p. 206, l. 11

¹⁷¹ est uoluntas Patris – tertia dirigenda] cfr THOMAS CIST., *In Cantica Canticorum*, lib. 9, f. 129ra dirigenda] fugienda *scripsit* Z

¹⁷² numquid] non quid *scripsit* Z

¹⁷³ numquid – uiuat] Ez. 18, 22

¹⁷⁴ In hiis¹ – Spiritus] AMBROSIUS MEDIOLANENSIS (DUBIUM), *Hymni* – ed. J Fontaine, (*CPL*, 163), 1992, hymnus 14, str. 7, ver. 25; ALCHERUS CLARAEUALLENSIS (DUBIUM) [= AUGUSTINUS (PSEUDO)], *De spiritu et anima* – ed. Migne, (*PL*, 40), cap. 60, col. 825, l. 36

235 est magis quam de nostro. De tertia, *caro concupiscit aduersus Spiritum*.¹⁷⁵ Ista tertia uoluntas
 numquam fuit in Christo quia nulla fuit in eo spiritus et carnis repugnancia qui conceptus est de
 sola gratia ‘sine carnis concupiscentia.’¹⁷⁶ Fuit tamen in eo uoluntas sensualitatis; id est naturalis,
 appetitus commodi, necessarii secundum quam uoluntatem nolebat mori quamuis uellet quicquid
 240 pater uolebat, tamen uoluntate consubstantiali tamquam Dei filius, tamen uoluntate rationali
 est ‘qui unam tantum uoluntatem et operationem’¹⁷⁸ credunt in Christo fuisse, cum secundum
 ueritatem fidei catholice tres diuerse uoluntates¹⁷⁹ in eo fuerit: uoluntas diuinitatis, uoluntas
 rationis, uoluntas sensualitatis. Prima ad diuinam naturam. Secunda et tertia ad humanam
 pertinebant. Prima imperabat; secunda prime obtemperabat; tertia a nature incommodis et maxime
 245 a peremptoriis abhorrebat, secundum hanc dictum est: *non ueni facere uoluntatem meam*¹⁸⁰ et
Pater, si fieri potest, transeat calicem hunc a me.¹⁸¹ <...> *non mea uoluntas sed tua fiat*.¹⁸² Sic
 ascendit homo super seipsum non faciendo carnis curam in desideriis obediendo diuinis preceptis
 et acquiescendo maiorum consiliis credendo supra quam capit intellectus humanus scripturarum
 sanctarum testimoniis. Porro super mundum ascendere est ipsum mundum uincere. Uincit autem
 250 qui non diligere qui non metuit quam eius similacio non se ducit, unde: *nolite diligere mundum*
neque ea que in mundo sunt, quoniam quicquid in mundo est et concupiscentia carnis est, et
concupiscentia oculorum, superbia uite.¹⁸³ Item *nolite mirari si odit uos mundus*.¹⁸⁴ Item *nolite*
timere eos qui occidunt corpus animam autem non possunt occidere.¹⁸⁵ Item *uidete ne quis uos*
seducat.¹⁸⁶

255 Hiis tribus periculis plenus¹⁸⁷ est mundus: muscipulis uoluptatum, offendiculis calamitatum,
 fouearum latibulis; id est insidiis hereticorum¹⁸⁸ et demonum, unde Isaiah: *formido et fouea et*
laqueus super te qui habitator es terre.¹⁸⁹ Formido pertinet ad aduersitatem que terret. Fouea ad
 felicitatem que in uno latet et que ad lapsum facilis est, unde super illum locum: *donec fodiat* | 50rb

¹⁷⁵ caro – Spiritum] Gal. 5, 17

¹⁷⁶ sine carne concupiscentia] AUGUSTINUS, *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* – ed. Migne, (PL, 45), lib. 6, col. 1553, l. 24

¹⁷⁷ homo uerus et uere iustus] cfr Iob 1, 1

¹⁷⁸ qui – operationem] SIGEBERTUS GEMBLACENSIS, *Liber de uiris illustribus* – ed. R. Witte, (*Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters*, Bd. 1), 1974, par. 59, p. 70

¹⁷⁹ uoluntates] uoluntas scripsit Z

¹⁸⁰ non ueni – meam] Ioh. 6, 38

¹⁸¹ Pater – a me] Matth. 26, 39; post ‘hunc a me’ vacant septem litterae

¹⁸² non mea – fiat] Luc. 22, 42

¹⁸³ nolite – uite] I Ioh. 2, 15 – 16

¹⁸⁴ nolite – mundus] I Ioh. 3, 13

¹⁸⁵ nolite – occidere] Matth. 10, 28

¹⁸⁶ uidete – seducat] Matth. 24, 4

¹⁸⁷ plenus] perlenus scripsit Z

¹⁸⁸ hereticorum] heredicatorum scripsit Z

¹⁸⁹ formido – terre] Is. 24, 17

260 *peccatori fouea*¹⁹⁰ digerit glosa “felicitas malorum fouea est; labor bonorum flagellum patris quia deus parcit per impunitatem¹⁹¹ fit homo elatus, et cum putat se altum, cadit.”¹⁹² Laqueus pertinet ad simulacionem. Igitur ad uincendum¹⁹³ mundum tria sunt: uetera fuga prosperitatis ne ueniat quasi contra uoluntatem uenerit temperancia corrumpat, unde: *diuicie si affluant nolite cor apponere*.¹⁹⁴ Reliqua duo sunt: patientia in aduersis discrecio in ambiguis ne uel aduersa frangant uel ambigua fallant, unde Dominus in euangelio: “*in mundo pressuram habebitis, sed confidite ego uici mundum*,”¹⁹⁵ uici seducentem, uici seruientem, uici seuientem.” ‘Uici seducentem’¹⁹⁶ cum temptator accederet. ‘Uici seruientem’ cum gaudium mihi proponeret, cum populus me regem facere uellet. ‘Uici seuientem’ cum crucis supplicium intemptaret. *Confidite ego uici mundum*¹⁹⁷ proposito gaudio, oblato regno, *crucem sustinui, confusione contempta*.¹⁹⁸

270 Sed quid adicere domine Ihesu, quid ad nos pertinet tua uictoria? Quia ratio consequencie ut ideo confidere debeamus nos fragiles et infirmi, quia tam forcior fortem uicisti. Exemplum forcioris: quid ualet infirmo? *Multum* inquit *per omnem modum*.¹⁹⁹ Nam si membra unius²⁰⁰ corporis estis sicut esse debetis, si caput et corpus unus est Christo, ergo Christi et Christiani indiscretus est spiritus et indiscreta uita. Igitur, et indiscreta uictoria. Igitur, *confidite* quia *ego uici mundum*.²⁰¹ Uici autem non solum mihi sed etiam uobis ut uos nec seducentis error fallat nec seruientis fauor
275 alliciat nec seuientis deuiat crimen. *Confidite*, ergo, habetis enim in uita mea exemplum pugne, in morte mea exemplum uictoria, in fide et in gratia mea adiutorium ad utrumque, unde: *omne quod natum est ex Deo uincit mundum et hec est uictoria que uincit mundum fides nostra*.²⁰² Magna uirtus fidei Christiane sibi tota mundi fortitudo suscepit.²⁰³

280 Sic ascenditur super mundum, porro *super celum ascendit*²⁰⁴ qui celestia concupiscit ‘qui dissolui cupit et esse cum Christo’²⁰⁵ qui uitam²⁰⁶ habet in patientia et mentem in desiderio. Igitur, *qui*

¹⁹⁰ donec – fouea] Ps. 93, 13

¹⁹¹ Impunitatem] in tria sunt punitatem *scripsit Z sed tria sunt expunxit*

¹⁹² felicitas – cadit] *Biblia Latin cum Glossa Ordinaria* – ed. Adolph Rusch of Strassburg (facsimile, editio princeps), 1481, vol. 2, p. 575-6, [Psalm 93:13]; PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Commentarium in Psalmos* – ed. Migne, (PL, 191), 1854, ps. 93, ver. 13, col. 870, ln 2

¹⁹³ uincendum] unicandum *scripsit Z*

¹⁹⁴ diuicie – apponere] Ps. 61, 11

¹⁹⁵ in mundo – mundum] Ioh. 16, 33

¹⁹⁶ seducentem] seducente *scripsit Z*

¹⁹⁷ confidite – mundum] Ioh. 16, 33

¹⁹⁸ proposito gaudio... crucem – contempta] Hebr. 12, 2

¹⁹⁹ multum...per omnem modum] Rom. 3, 2

²⁰⁰ unius] unum *scripsit Z*

²⁰¹ confidite – mundum] Ioh. 16, 33

²⁰² omne – nostra] I Ioh. 5, 4

²⁰³ suscepit] sucebit *scripsit Z*

²⁰⁴ super celum ascendit] Ps. 67, 34

²⁰⁵ qui dissolui – Christo] cfr Phil. 1, 23; et GREG. MAGN., *Dialogorum libri iv* – ed. A. de Vogüé (SC, 260), 1979, lib. 2, cap. 3, l. 96

²⁰⁶ uitam] uita *scripsit Z*

*descendit ipse est et qui ascendit*²⁰⁷ unde *egredietur uirga de radice Iesse*²⁰⁸ *et flos de radice eius ascendet*.²⁰⁹ Quo usque? Usque ad gradum summe potestatis, unde dicit: “*data est mihi omnis potestas in celo et in terra*,”²¹⁰ habuitque Christus gradus ascensionis diuersos, legitur ascendit²¹¹ in montem, in nauem, super asinum, in crucem, in celum. In mon|tem ascendit ut oraret et ut
 285 transfiguraretur; in nauem ut doceret et ut periclitantibus auxiliaretur; super asinum ut semetipsum humiliaret dum ab aliis honoraretur; in crucem ut nos a morte redimeret dum moreretur; in celum ut glorificaretur et glorificaret. Similiter nos in omnibus a gradibus²¹² orationem debemus premittere ut impetremus supernam gratiam et transfigurati per nouam uitam et docere simplices et eruire pereuntes et quanto magis honorantes ab hiis tanto magis nosmetipsos uiles reputare, *et*
 290 *carnem nostram cum uiciis et concupiscentiis sponte crucifigere*,²¹³ et celestem gloriam superdesiderare.

Item gradus ascensionis Christi trifariam diuiduntur: in donis, in miraculis, in celestibus regnis. Primos gradus enumerat Ysayas dicens, “*et requiescet super eum spiritus Domini: spiritus sapientie et intellectus, spiritus consilii et fortitudinis, spiritus scientie et pietatis; et replebit eum*
 295 *spiritus timoris Domini*.”²¹⁴ Ad horam gradus non ascendit ipse proficiendo per successionem temporum sed simul et semel peruenit usque ad summum participiando a primordio conceptionis sue plenitudinem donorum. Gradus in miraculorum eius sunt que fecit ipse nascendo, predicando, moriendo; in celo, in terra, in aqua. Nascendo in stella que apparuit, in templo pacis quod corruit,²¹⁵ in riuo olei qui de taberna meritoria profluxit.²¹⁶ Predicando quia in predicta²¹⁷
 300 transfiguratione uox Patris de celo intonuit; super aquas ambulauit; Lazarum suscitauit.²¹⁸ Moriendo quia sol in celo obfuscatus est; terra tremuit; sanguis cum aqua de latere mortui exeunt.²¹⁹ Gradus celestium regnorum sunt: qui surrexit de tumulo; qui intrauit ad discipulos foribus clausis; qui uidentibus illis eleuatus est, et nubes suscepit eum ab oculis eorum, et sic ascendit super omnem nubem, et super omnem aerem, super ethera, et super sidera. Super

²⁰⁷ qui – ascendit] Eph. 4, 10

²⁰⁸ Iesse] isse *scripsit* Z

²⁰⁹ egredietur – ascendet] Is. 11, 1

²¹⁰ data – terra] Matth. 28, 18

²¹¹ ascendit] ascen *scripsit* Z

²¹² a gradibus] agandis *scripsit* Z

²¹³ et carnem – crucifigere] Gal. 5, 24

²¹⁴ et requiescat – Domini²] Is. 11, 2 – 3

²¹⁵ In templo pacis quod corruit] cfr HELINANDI FRIGIDI MONTIS, *Sermones* – ed. Migne, (PL, 212), “Sermo II: I In Natali Domini,” col. 488

²¹⁶ In riuo olei – profluxit] cfr RUPERTUS TUITIENSIS, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius* – ed. R. Haacke, (CC CM, 21), 1971, p. 115, l. 4122; et HRABANUS MAURUS, *Expositio in Matthaeum* – ed. B. Löfstedt, (CC CM, 174), 2000, lib. 1, p. 53, l. 40

²¹⁷ predicta] predica *scripsit* Z

²¹⁸ super aquas – suscitauit] cfr BERNARDUS CLAR., *Sermones in ascensione Domini* – ed. J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (Bernardi opera, vol. 5), 1968, Sermo 2, par. 4, p. 126, l. 14

²¹⁹ exeunt] exunt *scripsit* Z

- 305 cherubin et super thronos uolauit. *Uolauit super pennas uentorum*,²²⁰ super omnes ordines angelorum, super omnes uirtutes celorum usque ad solium maiestatis paterne et dextre illius obsessum,²²¹ dicente Patre ad ipsum: “*sede a dextris meis donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum*.”²²² Et nos ergo descendamus ut ascendamus,²²³ humiliemur ut exaltemur sicut ait Petrus apostolus, *humiliamini sub potenti manu Dei ut uos exaltet in die uisitacionis*.²²⁴
- 310 Descendamus per gradum triplicem: subiectionis, compassionis, abiectiois. Subiciamus nos maiori, pari, minori: maiori²²⁵ per debitam necessitatem; pari per mutuam caritatem;| minori²²⁶ per 50vb
superhabundantem humilitatem. De primo, *obedite prepositis uestris et subiaceat eis*.²²⁷ De secundo, *honore inuicem preuenientes*.²²⁸ De tertio, *subiecti estote omni humane creature propter Deum*.²²⁹ Compassio uero duos gradus habet: sui et proximi. De primo, *miserere anime tue placans Deo*.²³⁰ De secundo, prout *potueris ita esto misericors*.²³¹ Abiectio similiter duos: mundi et sui. De primo, *nolite diligere mundum*.²³² De secundo, *qui uult uenire post me abneget semetipsum*.²³³ In hiis omnibus, debemus descendere corde, ore, et opere ut excludamus superbia, iactanciam, inanem gloriam.
- Similite ascendamus de malo ad bonum, de bono ad melius, de meliori ad optimum ut iustificemur, ut glorificemur. In primo sunt tres gradus: contritio, confessio, satisfaccio. Contritio cordis per dolorem; confessio oris per pudicitiam²³⁴; satisfaccio²³⁵ operis per laborem. In secundo sunt tres gradus: uitacio prohibitorum, adimplecio preceptorum, consiliorum supererogacio. In tertio sunt duo: anime et corporis glorificacio. Propter has ascensiones uocati sunt hodie discipuli Christi ‘uiri galilei’²³⁶; id est transmigrantes triplices²³⁷: transmigratio carnis, anime, et spiritus. Prima tres gradus habet: in corruendo, uidelicet ab amore boni, in delectacionem peccati; a delectacione in operationem; ab operatione in confusionem.
- 325 Transmigratio anime est in compunctione et hec tres gradus habet: a cognitione in confusionem, a

²²⁰ Uolauit – uentorum] Ps. 17, 11

²²¹ obsessum] oessum *scripsit Z*

²²² sede – tuorum] Ps. 109, 1

²²³ ut ascendamus] *in margine scripsit Z*

²²⁴ humiliamini – uisitacionis] I Petr. 5, 6

²²⁵ maiori] maiorum *scripsit Z*

²²⁶ minori] minorum *scripsit Z*

²²⁷ obedite – eis] Hebr. 13, 17

²²⁸ honore – preuenientes] Rom. 12, 10

²²⁹ subiecti – deum] I Petr. 2, 13

²³⁰ miserere – Deo] Eccli. 30, 24

²³¹ potueris – misericors] Tob. 4, 8

²³² nolite – mundum] I Ioh. 2, 15

²³³ qui uult – semetipsum] Matth. 16, 24

²³⁴ pudicitiam] pudiciem *scripsit Z*

²³⁵ satisfaccio] satisfacio *scripsit Z*

²³⁶ uiri Galilei] Act. 1, 11; cfr BERNARDUS CLAR., *Sermones in ascensione Domini*, Sermo 2, par. 4, p. 128, l. 23

²³⁷ triplices] triplex *scripsit Z*

330 confusione in effusionem²³⁸, ab effusione in suffusionem, id est, in plenam poenitentiae afflictionem. Transmigratio spiritus in caritate est cuius tres gradus sunt: a compunctione in iocunditatem, a iocunditate in operationem, ab operatio in contemplationem²³⁹. Primi galilei corruunt. Secundi ascendunt. Tertie uolant et capiuntur. Ascendamus, ergo, de dono in donum; id est de uirtute in uirtutem,²⁴⁰ ut possumus ascendere de miraculo in miraculum et de celo in celum. Quod enim miraculum maius est quam de peccatore iustum fieri, de incredulo fidelem, de liberto continentem, de superbo humilem? Quod maius miraculum quam de ebrioso fieri sobrium, de auaro largum, nouum de uetusto, uiuum de mortuo, saluum de perduto? Uerumtamen ut moraliter predicta saluatoris interpretemur miracula.

Sciendum est quod stella noua in nobis apparet in fidei confessione; templum pacis in nobis corrui in corporis castigacione; olei riuus largissimus effluit in elemosinarum largicione. Transfiguramur| quando uitam mutamus. Uox Patris super nos intonat quando inimicos diligimus 51ra
340 et pro persequentibus exoramus, unde scriptum est: *diligite inimicos uestros, benefacite hiis qui odiunt uos et orate pro persequentibus et calumniantibus uos ut sitis filii Patris uestri qui in celis est qui facit solem suum oriri super bonos et malos et pluit super iustos.*²⁴¹ Ambulamur super aquas quando terrenas contempnemus diuicias, calcamus²⁴² delicias. Fugimus dignitates quando nec prosperitas uos corrumpit nec aduersitas frangit. Mortuos suscitamus quando peccatores conuertimus. Sol²⁴³ nobis obscuratur quando gloria temporalis a nobis fugitur uel quando fama nostra ab emulis laceratur. Terra tremit quando timor eterni iudicii mentem nostram concutit. Sanguis et aqua de latere nostro profluit quando calicem saluatoris accipimus in passione pro iustitia et calicem proximi bibimus in compassione pro illius miseria. Sic ascenditur de miraculo in miraculum.

350 Porro ascensio de celo in celum comprehensoris est non uiatoris. Nisi forte et ipsos celos moratur, accipiamus iuxta illud Apostoli: *nostra autem conuersacio in celis est.*²⁴⁴ Sunt enim tres celi naturales: aerium, ethereum, empireum. De primo, *benedicite omnes uolucres celi Domino.*²⁴⁵ De secundo, *benedicite stelle celi Domino.*²⁴⁶ De tertio, *angeli eorum in celo sunt uident faciem Patris.*²⁴⁷ Primum celum est compunctio, secundum deuotio, tertium feruidum. In primo loquitur nobis Deus uerba aperta; in secundo secreta; in tertio ineffabilia. In primo petimus et accipimus 355 ueniam delictorum. In secundo querimus et inuenimus gratiam meritorum. In tertio pulsamus et

²³⁸ effusionem] confusionem *scripsit Z*

²³⁹ contemplationem] contemplatione *scripsit Z*

²⁴⁰ de uirtute in uirtutem] Ps. 83, 8

²⁴¹ diligite – iustos] Matth. 4, 44 – 45

²⁴² calcamus] calamus *scripsit Z sed c addidit supra lineam*

²⁴³ Sol] soli *scripsit Z*

²⁴⁴ nostra – celis est] Phil. 3, 20

²⁴⁵ benedicite omnes – Domino] Dan. 3, 80

²⁴⁶ benedicite stelle – Domino] Dan. 3, 63

²⁴⁷ angeli – Patris] Matth. 18, 10

aperietur uobis²⁴⁸ ad gloriam premiorum uel sic primum celum est subditorum, secundum
prelatorum, tertium beatorum.

360 Tres sunt gradus subditorum: incipientes, proficientes, perfecti²⁴⁹ uel penitentes, operantes,
contemplatiui. Triplex est qualitas primi celi, aer; enim humidus est, tractabilis, calidus.
Penitentes sunt in humido, id est in luctu; operantes in tractabilia in obauditu; contemplatiui in
calido, hic est, in celestium appetitu.

365 Celum ethereum tres proprietates habent; est enim serenum, stellatum, firmum; †prelatorum
egregiorum²⁵⁰ scilicet qui uerum prestant† semper esse serenos ut quieti expeccatis siue turbela
animi permaneant, semper esse stellatos uariis uirtutibus et illustratibus²⁵¹ sermonibus ut opere et
sermone apud subiectos luceant, semper esse firmos et solidos ut nullus fracti molestiis
succumbant. De primo est illud Senece: “talis est sapientis animus qualis mundi²⁵² super lunam:
super illic serenum est.”²⁵³ De secundo, illud Apostoli: *in medio nacionis praue et peruerse inter*
370 *quos lucetis tamquam luminaria in firmamento celi uerbum uite continentes.*²⁵⁴ De tercio, in Iob
qui *solidi ut ere fusi sunt.*²⁵⁵

51rb

375 Celum empireum tres habent proprietates; est enim sublimissimum, lucidissimum, iocundissimum.
In sublimitate potencia; in luce sapientia; in iocunditate plena dilectio simul et delectacio
designatur²⁵⁶. Hec tria continet status beatorum: plenam potenciam, sapientiam, dilectionem ex
quibus summa nascitur delectacio, summa iocunditas et summum gaudium. Ad quod nos perducatur
et per gradus meritorum ascendere faciat *qui hodie ascendit super omnes celos*²⁵⁷ tam mortales
quam spirituales Ihesus Christus Dominus Noster.

²⁴⁸ Petimus – aperietur uobis] cfr Matth. 7, 7: Petite, et dabitur uobis: quaerite, et inuenietis:
pulsate, et aperietur uobis.

²⁴⁹ incipientes, proficientes, perfecti] BERNARDUS CLAR., *Sermones in natali sancti Andreae* – ed.
J. Leclercq et H. M. Rochais, (*Bernardi opera*, vol. 5), 1968, Sermo 1, par. 4, p. 430, l. 3

²⁵⁰ prelatorum – prestant] *dubium*

²⁵¹ illustratibus] *illustratius scripsit Z*

²⁵² mundi] *mundus scripsit Z*

²⁵³ talis – serenum est] SENECA, *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium* – ed. O. Hense, (*Teubner*), 1938,
epist. 59, par. 16, p. 192

²⁵⁴ in medio – continentes] Phil. 2, 15

²⁵⁵ solidi – sunt] Iob 37:18

²⁵⁶ designatur] *designatur bis scripsit Z*

²⁵⁷ qui – celos] Eph. 4, 10

Works Cited

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Aelred of Rievaulx. *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera omnia*. Edited by Anselm Hoste, C. H. Talbot, and Gaetano Raciti. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 1, 2A–2D. Turnhout: Brepols, 1971.
- . *Aelredi Rievallensis sermones*. Edited by Gaetano Raciti. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 2A–2C. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.
- . *Homeliae de oneribus propheticiis Isaiae*. Edited by Gaetano Raciti. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 2D. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- . “Jesus at the Age of Twelve.” In *The Works of Aelred of Rievaulx, Volume I: Treatises, The Pastoral Prayer*, translated by Theodore Berkeley, 1–40. Cistercian Fathers Series 2. Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1971.
- . *Opera ascetica*. Edited by Anselm Hoste and Charles H. Talbot. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1971.
- . *The Works of Aelred of Rievaulx, Volume I: Treatises, The Pastoral Prayer*. Translated by Theodore Berkeley, Mary Paul Macpherson, and R. Penelope Lawson. Cistercian Fathers Series 2. Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1971.
- Athanasius. “The Life and Affairs of Our Holy Father Antony.” In *Athanasius*, translated by Robert C. Gregg, 29–100. Classics of Western Spirituality. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980.
- Atsma, Hartmut, Sébastien Barret, and Jean Vezin, eds. *Les plus anciens documents originaux de l’abbaye de Cluny*. 2 vols. Monumenta palaeographica medii aevi. Series gallica. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Augustine. *De civitate Dei*. Edited by B. Dombart and A. Kalb. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 47, 48. Turnhout: Brepols, 1955.
- . *On Christian Doctrine*. Translated by D. W. Robertson, Jr. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Benedict of Nursia. *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*. Translated by Timothy Fry. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1982.
- Bernard, Auguste, and Alexandre Bruehl, eds. *Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de Cluny*. Vol. I. Collection de documents inédits sur l’histoire de France. Paris, 1876.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *Bernard of Clairvaux: Selected Works*. Edited by G. R. Evans. Classics of Western Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.

- . *Cistercians and Cluniacs: St. Bernard's Apologia to Abbot William*. Edited by Jean Leclercq. Translated by Michael Casey. Cistercian Fathers Series 1. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1970.
- . *Epistulae*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 7. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1974.
- . *Epistulae*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 8. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1977.
- . *In Praise of the New Knighthood: A Treatise on the Knights Templar and the Holy Places of Jerusalem*. Translated by M. Conrad Greenia. Monastic Studies Series 25. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2010.
- . *Parabola*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 6.2. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1972.
- . *Sancti Bernardi Opera*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. 8 vols. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957.
- . *Sermones II*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 5. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1968.
- . *Sermones in Ascensione Domini*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 5. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1968.
- . *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 1–2. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957.
- . *Sermones super psalmum "Qui habitat."* Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 4. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1966.
- . *Sermons for the Summer Season: Liturgical Sermons from Rogationtide and Pentecost*. Translated by Beverly Mayne Kienzle. Cistercian Fathers Series 53. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1991.
- . *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*. Translated by Bruno Scott James. Cistercian Fathers Series 62. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1998.
- . *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume I: Treatises I*. Edited by M. Basil Pennington. Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1970.
- . *Tractatus et Opuscula*. Edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles H. Talbot, and Henri Rochais. Sancti Bernardi Opera 3. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963.
- Bettenson, Henry, and Chris Maunder, eds. *Documents of the Christian Church*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

- Bouton, Jean de la Croix, and Jean Baptiste van Damme, eds. *Les plus anciens texts de Cîteaux*. Cîteaux. Studia et documenta 2. Achel: Abbaye cistercienne, 1974.
- Canivez, D. Josephus M., ed. *Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786, I (1116–1220)*. Bibliothèque de la Revue d’hist. eccl. 9. Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1933.
- Einhard. “The Life of Charlemagne.” In *Two Lives of Charlemagne*, translated by Lewis Thorpe, 49–90. Penguin, 1969.
- Glaber, Rodulfus. *Rodulfi Glabri historiarum libri quinque et eiusdem auctoris Vita Domni Willelmi Abbatis*. Edited by Neithard Bulst. Translated by John France and Paul Reynolds. Vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Hildegard of Bingen. *Homilies on the Gospels*. Translated by Beverly Mayne Kienzle. Cistercian Studies Series 241. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2011.
- Idung of Prüfening. *Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Case for Cîteaux*. Translated by Jeremiah O’Sullivan. Cistercian Fathers Series 33. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1977.
- Mabillon, John, ed. *Life and Works of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*. Translated by Samuel J. Eales. 2nd ed. 4 vols. Catholic Standard Library. London: John Hodges, 1889.
- Noble, Thomas F. X., and Thomas Head, eds. *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints’ Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Origen. *On First Principles*. Translated by G. W. Butterworth. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Peters, Edward, ed. *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
- Peter the Venerable. *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*. Edited by Giles Constable. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Harvard Historical Studies 78. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, Philip Schaff, and Henry Wace, eds. *Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, Second Series*. Vol. 1. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1990.
- Tertullian. “On the Prescription of Heretics.” In *On the Testimony of the Soul and On the “Prescription” of Heretics*, translated by T. Herbert Bindley. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1914.
- Tissier, Bertrand. *Bibliothecae Patrum Cisterciensium*. Vol. 6. Bonofonte, 1669.

Waddell, Chrysogonus, ed. *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: Latin Text in Dual Edition with English Translation and Notes*. Cîteaux. Studia et documenta 9. Cîteaux: Commentarii cistercienses, 1999.

———. *The Twelfth-Century Cistercian Hymnal*. Cistercian Liturgy Series 1–2. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1984.

William of Saint-Thierry. *The Nature and Dignity of Love*. Translated by Thomas X. Davis. Cistercian Fathers Series 30. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1981.

Wollasch, Joachim, Wolf-Dieter Heim, Joachim Mehne, Franz Neiske, and Dietrich Poeck, eds. *Synopse der cluniacensichen Necrologen, I: Einleitung und Register, II: Die Synopse*. 2 vols. Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 39.1–2. Munich, 1982.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Baker, Timothy M., and Beverly Mayne Kienzle. "Hélinand of Froidmont." *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*. 10. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.
http://www.degruyter.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/view/EBR/key_4b5cbba3-0582-4e54-a5d3-737c9f27fb8b.
- Batto, Bernard F. "The Reed Sea: Requiescat in Pace." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 1 (March 1983): 27–35.
- Berman, Constance H. "A Response to McGuire and Waddell." *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 53 (2002): 333–37.
- . *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Bouchard, Constance B. "Review of 'The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century France,' by Constance Hoffman Berman." *Journal of Religion* 81, no. 1 (2001): 119–20.
- Brown, Peter. *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Bruce, Scott G. "[Review] Construire une société seigneuriale: Itinéraire et ecclésiologie de l'abbé Odon de Cluny (fin du IXe–milieu du Xe siècle). By Isabelle Rosé. Collection d'études médiévales de Nice 8. Turnhout: Brepols. 2008. 732 pp. €55. ISBN 978 2 503 51835 0." *Early Medieval Europe* 19, no. 4 (2011): 468–70.
- Bruun, Mette Birkedal. "Mapping the Monastery: Hélinand of Froidmont's Second Sermon for Palm Sunday." In *Prédication et liturgie au Moyen Âge*, edited by Nicole Bériou and Franco Morenzoni, 183–99. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- . *Parables: Bernard of Clairvaux's Mapping of Spiritual Topography*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 148. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007.
- . , ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*. Cambridge Companions to Religion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Burton, Janet. "Rievaulx Abbey: The Early Years." In *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honor of Peter Fergusson*, edited by Terryl N. Kinder and Peter Fergusson, 47–53. *Medieval Church Studies* 11. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing." In *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, 110–69. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982.

- . *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982.
- . *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*. Lectures on the History of Religions 15. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- . “Women’s Stories, Women’s Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner’s Theory of Liminality.” In *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*, 27–51. Zone Books, 1991.
- Carruthers, Mary J. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Cassidy-Welch, Megan. *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries*. Medieval Church Studies 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.
- Cazabonne, Emma. “Aelred of Rievaulx and the ‘Cities of Refuge.’” *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2007): 267–98.
- Ceresko, Anthony R. “Psalm 121: A Prayer of a Warrior?” *Biblica* 70, no. 4 (1989): 496–510.
- Chenu, Marie Dominique. *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*. 2nd revised. MART: The Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Chidester, David, and Edward S. Linenthal. *American Sacred Spaces*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Cole, Penny J. *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1991.
- Conant, Kenneth J. *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800–1200*. 4th ed. Yale University Press, 1992.
- Constable, Giles. “Review of Joachim Wollasch, ed., with Wolf-Dieter Hiem / Joachim Mehne / Franz Neiske / Dietrich Poeck, Synopse der cluniachensichen Necrologien, I: Einleitung und Register, II: Der Synopse (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 39.1–2), Munich 1982.” *Speculum* 60 (1985): 208–11.
- . *The Abbey of Cluny: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundredth Anniversary of Its Foundation*. Abhandlungen 43. Berlin: LIT, 2010.
- . “The Commemoration of the Dead in the Early Middle Ages.” In *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, edited by Julia M. H. Smith, 188–95. Leiden/Boston/Cologne, 2000.

- . *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Coomans, Thomas. “Cistercian Architecture or Architecture of the Cistercians?” In *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, edited by Mette Birkedal Bruun, 151–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Copeland, Rita, and Ineke Sluiter. “Grammatical Commentaries From the ‘School’ of Ralph of Beauvais, ca. 1165–1175.” In *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric : Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300–1475*, 511–17. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Cowdrey, Herbert E. J. “Cluny and the First Crusade.” *Revue Bénédictine* 83 (1973): 285–311.
- . *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Dahood, Mitchell J. *Psalms III: 101–150*. Anchor Bible Series 17A. Garden City, 1970.
- Davis, Michael T. “Cistercians in the City: The Church of the Collège Saint-Bernard in Paris.” In *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honor of Peter Fergusson*, edited by Terryl N. Kinder and Peter Fergusson, 223–34. Medieval Church Studies 11. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Delarc, O. *Saint Grégoire VII et la réforme de l’église au XIe siècle*. 3 vols. Paris, 1889.
- Delaruelle, Étienne. “L’idée de croisade dans la littérature clunisienne du XIe siècle et l’abbaye de Moissac.” In *Moissac et l’Occident au XIe siècle*. Actes du colloque international de Moissac 3–5 mai 1963. Toulouse, 1964.
- . “The Crusading Idea in Cluniac Literature of the Eleventh Century.” In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, edited by Noreen Hunt, 191–216. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.
- de Lubac, Henri. *Exégèse médiévale; les quatre sens de l’Ecriture*. Vol. II. Paris: Aubier, 1959.
- . *Medieval Exegesis*. 3 vols. Ressourcement. Grand Rapids, Mich./Edinburgh: W.B. Eerdmans/T&T Clark, 1998.
- de Valous, Guy. “Les monastères et la pénétration française en Espagne du XIe au XIIIe siècle.” *Revue Mabillon* 30 (1940).
- de Vogüé, Adalbert. *The Rule of Saint Benedict: A Doctrinal and Spiritual Commentary*. Translated by John Baptist Hasbrouck. Cistercian Studies Series 54. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1983.
- Duby, Georges, and Arthur Goldhammer. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

- Dumontier, M. "Hélinand de Froidmont et la liturgie." *Collectanea ordinis cisterciensium reformatorem* 14 (1952): 33–139, 213–15 and 295–300.
- . "Hélinand de Froidmont et la liturgie." *Collectanea ordinis cisterciensium reformatorem* 17 (1955): 49–56 and 118–25.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. London: Sheed and Ward, 1958.
- . *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Erdmann, Carl. *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*. Edited and translated by Marshall Baldwin and Walter Goffart. Princeton, 1977.
- Evans, Joan. *Cluniac Art of the Romanesque Period*. Cambridge University Press, 1950.
- Finucane, Ronald. *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.
- Flanagan, Marie Therese. *The Transformation of the Irish Church in the Twelfth Century*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010.
- France, James. *Separate but Equal: Cistercian Lay Brothers, 1120–1350*. Cistercian Studies Series 246. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Gajewski, Alexandra. "The Architecture of the Choir at Clairvaux Abbey: Saint Bernard and the Cistercian Principle of Conspicuous Poverty." In *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honor of Peter Fergusson*, edited by Terryl N. Kinder and Peter Fergusson, 71–80. Medieval Church Studies 11. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Gibbon, Edward. *A History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Edited by J. B. Bury. Vol. 4. London, 1912.
- Grimes, Ronald L. *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*. Rev. ed. Studies in Comparative Religion. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- Hallinger, Kassius, and Noreen Hunt. "The Spiritual Life of Cluny." In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, 29–55. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971.
- Hall, Thomas. "The Early Medieval Sermon." In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Kienzle, 203–47. Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 81–83. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Hanawalt, Barbara A., and Michal Kobialka, eds. *Medieval Practices of Space*. Medieval Cultures 23. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

- Harris, Jennifer A. "Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as 'Locus Sanctissimus' in the Eleventh Century." In *From Dead of Night to End of Day: The Medieval Customs of Cluny*, edited by Susan Boynton and Isabelle Cochelin, 131–51. *Disciplina Monastica* 3. Brepols, 2005.
- . "The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages." In *Sacrifice in Religious Experience*, edited by Albert I Baumgarten, 233–56. *Studies in the History of Religions* 93. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Hayes, John H. *Understanding the Psalms*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.
- Heath, Robert. *Crux imperatorum philosophia: Imperial Horizons of the Cluniac Confraternitas 964–1109*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 13. Pittsburgh, 1976.
- Holdsworth, Christopher. "Bernard as Father Abbot." In *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux*, edited by Brian Patrick McGuire, 169–219. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . "Were the Sermons of St Bernard on the Song of Songs Ever Preached?" In *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, edited by Carolyn Muessig, 295–318. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 90. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998.
- Hourlier, Jacques. "St Odilo's Monastery." In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, edited by Noreen Hunt, 56–76. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.
- Hunt, Noreen. "Cluniac Monasticism." In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, edited by Noreen Hunt, 1–10. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971.
- . *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049–1109*. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd., 1967.
- Hunt, R. W. "Studies on Priscian in the Twelfth Century II: The School of Ralph of Beauvais." *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1950): 1–56.
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique. *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*. Translated by Graham Robert Edwards. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Keet, C. C. *A Study of the Psalms of Ascent: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary upon Ps 120–134*. London, 1972.
- Kienzle, Beverly Mayne. *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229: Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard*. Rochester: York Medieval Press/Boydell Press, 2001.
- . "Deed and Word. Hélinand's Toulouse Sermons I." In *Erudition at God's Service. Studies in Medieval Cistercian History II*, edited by J. R. Sommerfeldt, 267–76. Cistercian Studies Series 98. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1987.

- . “Education in the Late Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries. The Witness of Hélinand of Froidmont.” In *Faith Seeking Understanding. Learning and the Catholic Tradition*, edited by G. Berthold, 77–88. Manchester, NH: Saint Anselm College Press, 1991.
- . “Erudition at God’s Service: Hélinand’s Toulouse Sermons II.” In *Erudition at God’s Service*, edited by J. R. Sommerfeldt, 277–90. Cistercian Studies Series 98. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1987.
- . “Hildegard of Bingen’s Gospel Homilies and Her Exegesis of the Parable of the Prodigal Son.” In *Im Angesicht Gottes suche der mensch sich selbst*. Mainz, 1998.
- . “Maternal Imagery in the Sermons of Helinand of Froidmont.” In *De Ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, edited by Thomas L. Amos, Eugene A. Green, and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 93–103. Kalamazoo, Mich., 1989.
- . “Preaching the Cross: Liturgy and Crusade Propaganda.” *Medieval Sermon Studies* 53, no. 1 (2009): 11–32.
- . “The House of the Lord: Hélinand on Superfluous Monastic Construction.” *Proceedings of the PMR Conference* 11 (1986): 135–41.
- . , ed. *The Sermon*. Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 81–83. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- . “The Sermon as Goad and Nail. Preaching in Hélinand of Froidmont.” In *Goad and Nail: Studies in Medieval Cistercian History* 9, edited by E. R. Elder, 228–40. Cistercian Studies Series 84. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1985.
- . “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon.” In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 271–323. Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 81–83. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Knowles, David. “The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable.” In *Petrus Venerabilis 1156–1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of His Death*, edited by Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, 1–20. Studia Anselmiana 40. Rome: Herder, 1956.
- Kobialka, Michal. “Staging Place/Space in the Eleventh-Century Monastic Practices.” In *Medieval Practices of Space*, edited by Barbara A. Hanawalt and Michal Kobialka, 128–48. Medieval Cultures 23. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Lackner, Bede K. *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux*. Cistercian Studies Series 8. Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1972.
- Leclercq, Jean. *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale. Etapes et constantes*. Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1964.

- . “Études Sur S. Bernard et Le Texte de Ses écrits.” *Analecta Cisterciensia* 9 (1953): 45–83.
- . “Passage supprimé dans une épître d’Alexandre III.” *Revue bénédictine* 62 (1952): 149–51.
- . “Pierre le Vénérable et l’érémisme clunisien.” In *Petrus Venerabilis 1156–1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of His Death*, edited by Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, 99–120. *Studia Anselmiana* 40. Rome: Herder, 1956.
- . *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*. Translated by Catherine Misrahi. 3rd ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 1982.
- . “The Monastic Crisis of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries.” In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, edited by Noreen Hunt, 217–37. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.
- . “The Mystery of the Ascension in the Sermons of Saint Bernard.” Translated by Sister Elizabeth Connor, O.C.S.O. *Cistercian Studies* 25, no. 1 (1990): 9–16.
- . “Une ancienne rédaction des coutumes cisterciennes.” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 47 (1952): 172–76.
- . “Une nouvelle réponse de l’ancien monachisme aux critiques des cisterciens.” *Revue bénédictine* 67 (1957): 77–94.
- . “Were the Sermons on the Song of Songs Delivered in Chapter?” In *On the Song of Songs*, translated by Kilian Walsh, II:vii – xxx. *Cistercian Fathers Series* 7. Kalamazoo, Mich., 1976.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *Medieval Civilization, 400–1500*. Translated by Julia Barrow. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- . *The Medieval Imagination*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Lekai, Louis J. *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1977.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Lipton, Sara G. “Jews, Heretics, and the Sign of the Cat in the Bible moralisée.” *Word and Image* 8 (1992): 362–77.
- Lynch, Joseph H. *The Medieval Church: A Brief History*. London/New York: Longman, 1992.

- Madigan, Kevin. *Medieval Christianity: A New History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Mayer, Hans Eberhard. *The Crusades*. Translated by John Gillingham. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1998.
- McGuire, Brian Patrick. *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011.
- . “Bernard’s Concept of a Cistercian Order: Vocabulary and Context.” *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 54 (2003): 225–49.
- . “Charity and Unanimity: The Invention of the Cistercian Order. A Review Article.” *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 51 (2000): 285–97.
- Meyer, Ann R. *Medieval Allegory and the Building of the New Jerusalem*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003.
- Morghen, Raffaello, and Noreen Hunt. “Monastic Reform and Cluniac Spirituality.” In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, 11–28. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.
- Nagy, Gregory. *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2013.
- Newman, Martha G. “Book Review: The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe.” *Catholic Historical Review* 87, no. 2 (2001): 315–16.
- . *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180*. Figueras. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Noble, Thomas F. X. *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*. Middle Ages Series. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Obert-Piketty, Colette. “Benoît XII et les collèges cisterciens du Languedoc.” In *Les Cisterciens de Languedoc (XIII-XIV siècle)*, 139–50. Cahiers de Fanjeaux 21, 1986.
- Ouy, Gilbert. *Les manuscrits de l’abbaye de Saint-Victor: Catalogue établi sur la base du repertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*. 2 vols. Bibliotheca Victorina 10, 1999.
- Pacaut, Marcel. *Les moines blancs: Histoire de l’ordre de Cîteaux*. Fayard, 1993.
- Paden, William D. “De monachis rithmos facientibus: Hélinant de Froidmont, Bertran de Born, and the Cistercian General Chapter of 1199.” *Speculum* 55, no. 4 (October 1980): 669–85.
- Poeck, Dietrich. *Cluniacensis ecclesia: der cluniacensische Klosterverband (10.–12. Jahrhundert)*. Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 71. Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1998.

- Pranger, M. B. *Bernard of Clairvaux and the Shape of Monastic Thought: Broken Dreams*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 56. Leiden/New York: Brill, 1997.
- . "Mystical Tropology in Bernard of Clairvaux." *Bijdragen, tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 52, no. 4 (1991): 428–35.
- Prawer, Joshua. *Histoire du Royaume latin de Jérusalem*. CNRS Editions, 2007.
- Reilly, Diane J. "Art." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, edited by Mette Birkedal Bruun, 125–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Renna, Thomas. "Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon." In *Law, Custom, and the Social Fabric in Medieval Europe: Essays in Honor of Bryce Lyon*, edited by Bernard S. Bachrach and David Nicholas, 73–88. Studies in Medieval Culture 28. Kalamazoo, Mich., 1990.
- Roberts, Phyllis B. "Medieval University Preaching: The Evidence in the Statutes." In *Medieval Sermons and Society: Cloister, City, University: Proceedings of International Symposia at Kalamazoo and New York*, edited by J. Hamesse, B. M. Kienzle, D. L. Stoudt, and A. T. Thayer, 317–28. Textes et études du moyen âge 9. Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'études médiévales, 1998.
- Rombs, Ronnie J., and Alexander Y. Hwang, eds. *Tradition & The Rule of Faith in the Early Church*. The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- Rosé, Isabelle. *Construire une société seigneuriale: Itinéraire et ecclésiologie de l'abbé Odon de Cluny (fin du IXe–milieu du Xe siècle)*. Collection d'études médiévales de Nice 8. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Rosenwein, Barbara. "Cluny's Immunities in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. Images and Narratives." In *Die Cluniazenser in ihrem politisch-sozialen Umfeld*, edited by Giles Constable, Gert Melville, and Jörg Oberste, 133–63. Vita regularis 7. Münster: LIT, 1998.
- . "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression." *Viator* 2 (1972): 129–58.
- . "La question de l'immunité clunisienne." *Bulletin de la société des fouilles archéologiques et des monuments historique de l'Yonne* 12 (1995).
- Rouse, Richard H. "Gilbert Ouy, Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: Catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)." *Speculum* 77, no. 3 (July 2002): 962–63.
- Rouse, Richard H., and Mary A. Rouse. *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus Florum of Thomas of Ireland*. Toronto, 1979.

- . “Statim Invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page.” *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, 1982, 201–25.
- Sackur, Ernst. *Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts*. 2 vols. Halle, 1894.
- Schneyer, Johannes Baptist. *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters: für d. Zeit von 1150–1350*. 11 vols. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen 43. Münster: Aschendorff, 1969.
- Signer, Michael. “Restoring the Narrative: Jewish and Christian Exegesis in the Twelfth Century.” In *With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edited by Jane D. McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish, and Joseph W. Goering, 70–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. “Constructing a Small Place.” In *Sacred Space: Shrine, City, Land*, edited by Benjamin Z. Kedar and R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, 18–31. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- . “The Wobbling Pivot.” *The Journal of Religion*, 1972, 134–49.
- Smits, Edmé R. “Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text of Seneca’s Tragedies.” *Mnemosyne* 36, no. fasc. 3–4 (1983): 324–58.
- Sommerfeldt, John R. *Aelred of Rievaulx on Love and Order in the World and the Church*. Paulist Press, 2006.
- Stewart, Columba. “The Use of Biblical Texts in Prayer and the Formation of Early Monastic Culture.” *The American Benedictine Review* 62, no. 2 (2011): 188–201.
- Stock, Brian. *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- . *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Thayer, Anne T. “Judith and Mary: Helinand’s Sermon for the Assumption.” In *Medieval Sermons and Society: Proceedings of International Symposia at Kalamazoo and New York*, edited by J. Hamesse, B. M. Kienzle, D. L. Stoudt, and A. T. Thayer, 63–75. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998.
- Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050–1300: With Selected Documents*. Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 21. Toronto/Buffalo: Published by University of Toronto Press in association with the Medieval Academy of America, 1988.
- Turner, Victor. “Liminality and Communitas.” In *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, 94–130. Aldine de Gruyter, 1995.

- . *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Van Engen, John. “The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem.” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 519–52.
- van Gannep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.
- Vauchez, André. *The Spirituality of the Medieval West: From the Eighth to the Twelfth Century*. Translated by Colette Friedlander. Cistercian Studies Series 145. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1993.
- Waddell, Chrysogonus. “The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Cistercian Preaching.” In *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, edited by Carolyn Muessig, 335–50. Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 90. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998.
- . “The Myth of Cistercian Origins: C. H. Berman and the Manuscript Sources.” *Cîteaux Commentarii Cistercienses* 51 (2000): 299–386.
- Webb, Diana. *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c.700–c.1500*. European Culture and Society. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- White, Lewis. “Bifarie itaque potest legi: Ambivalent Exegesis in Aelred of Rievaulx’s *De Oneribus*.” *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2007): 299–327.
- Wollasch, Joachim. “A Cluniac Necrology from the Time of Abbot Hugh.” In *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, edited by Noreen Hunt, 143–90. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.